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This study utilized Eudaimonic Theory (ET), an Aristotelian perspective on human flourishing (eudaimonia), to explore new eudaimonic goal hierarchy hypotheses. The ET model distinguishes between two types of well-being: Eudaimonic Well-Being (EWB) and Hedonic Well-Being (HWB), and two dimensions of goal pursuit: the Communal Dimension and the Agency Dimension. HWB refers to experiencing high positive affect, low negative affect and high life satisfaction. EWB is assessed through factors such as purpose, personal growth and positive relationships giving. The Communal Dimension refers to a distinction between individual goals, which can only be pursued by one person and shared goals, which are completely collective accomplishments. The Agency Dimension refers to a distinction between Instrumental Goals, in which the means and ends are separable, and Constitutive Goals, in which means constitute the ends. This study used SEM and was the first to empirically test Agency, Communion, and Well-Being relationships simultaneously. Extending earlier findings, EWB related to both Instrumental and Constitutive Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals; while for Individual Goals, HWB related to Instrumental and Constitutive Goal Pursuit. Shared Goal Orientation significantly related to HWB for Individual Goals but not to EWB for Interpersonal Goals. Contrary to hypothesis, Shared Goal Orientation did not augment the relationships between either Instrumental Goal Pursuit and HWB, or Constitutive Goal
Pursuit and EWB. Results suggest that Agency and Communion have some additive but no multiplicative effects on Well-Being.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

For millennia, philosophers have pondered what makes the good life. Recently, psychologists have become increasingly interested in happiness and human flourishing (e.g., Csikszentmihalyi, 2014; Diener, 2000; Fowers, 2005; Keyes, Schmotkin, & Ryff, 2003; Seligman, 2004). Often researchers examine well-being through the study of personal goals, which serve as convenient analytical units to investigate human motivation and life purpose (Emmons, 2003). Although well-being and goal pursuit are multidimensional psychosocial constructs, their study, like much contemporary psychology research, has been biased by three generally unacknowledged assumptions: hedonism, instrumentalism, and individualism (e.g., Fowers, 2010, 2012, 2015).

The Good Life in Contemporary Psychology

In the hopes of creating a full-fledged science of well-being, many psychologists have attempted to adhere to a strict value-neutrality. This means that many psychologists routinely deny or are ambivalent about recognizing virtue and the human good as moral endeavors. However, denying that cultural values play a role in psychology has not prevented hidden assumptions from informing scholarly conceptualizations of the human good in theory, research, and clinical practice. These psychologists have veiled their conceptualizations of what is good by utilizing behavioral language and assessment and measures of subjective satisfaction. In spite of its attempts to obscure cultural value commitments, psychology has endorsed human goods such as efficacy (e.g., Bandura, 1997), autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 2000), and satisfaction (Diener et al., 2000). This has inadvertently biased much of well-
being research by focusing excessive attention on hedonic indicators that separate individuals pursue through means-end activity (e.g., Fowers, 2012). Although many psychologists have contributed to these biases, it is not true of the entire field both historically (e.g., Brofenbrenner, 1974; Sullivan, 1947) and more contemporarily (Ellis & Abdi, 2017, Neild, 2009). Constructivists and critical psychologists recognize the role of both researcher and participant values and ideologies in their conceptualization of living well. For instance, Alfred Adler (1957) introduced the social interest or community feeling concept, which laid the foreground of modern community psychology. Community psychology was developed with the specific purpose of “going beyond an individual focus and integrates social, cultural, economic, political, environmental, and international influences to promote positive change, health, and empowerment at individual and systemic levels” (Society for Community Research & Action, 2017, p. 1). Further, interpersonal psychoanalysis (Leary, 1957; Sullivan, 1947) helped bring the focus beyond the individual. Nevertheless, the most common practice of psychologists has been to take an individualistic, instrumental, and hedonic view.

**Eudaimonic Theory**

Although researchers have illuminated many important aspects of living well, most have failed to capture deeper and more meaningful components of the good life. Eudaimonic theory (ET; Fowers, 2005, 2012, 2015) is a framework for understanding human flourishing based on Aristotle’s (1999) concept of eudaimonia, often translated as human flourishing. ET was developed as a theoretical model that could show how to transcend the three generally unacknowledged assumptions of
hedonism, individualism, and instrumentalism. ET follows Aristotle’s view that eudaimonia emerges through the active pursuit of excellence or virtue. Eudaimonia is a philosophical construct, which makes it difficult to test, so social scientists who study it generally employ self-report measures of eudaimonic well-being (EWB).

ET includes a neo-Aristotelian theoretical approach to goal pursuit and well-being. A major focus of ET is the distinction in types of well-being, including both HWB and EWB. HWB refers to experiencing high positive affect, low negative affect, and high life satisfaction (e.g., Diener, 2000). EWB is assessed through factors such as meaning, purpose, personal growth, and positive relationships giving (Fowers, Mollica & Procacci, 2010; Huta & Waterman, 2014).

A number of studies have supported a two-dimensional structure of well-being based on a meaning or personal growth dimension and a positive affect or satisfaction dimension (e.g., Compton, Smith, Cornish, & Qualls, 1996; Fowers et al., 2010a; Huta & Ryan, 2010; Keyes et al., 2002; McGregor & Little, 1998; Waterman, 1993). In these studies, HWB and EWB are distinct but related forms of well-being, supporting the ET premise that eudaimonia and hedonia are separate types of well-being (Fowers, 2005).

Research on EWB provides a way to move beyond an exclusive focus on HWB, which is one way to move beyond hedonism. ET transcends the hidden assumption of individualism by demonstrating that not all-important goals can be pursued autonomously by fundamentally separate individuals (individual goals) and that some important goals, such as friendship and democracy, can only be achieved in communion with others (shared goals). ET overcomes the assumption of
instrumentalism by postulating that not all goals are means to an end (instrumental goals) and that for some goals the means constitute the ends (constitutive goals). These goal dimensions are explained more fully in Chapter 2. This study expands on this important work by being the first to empirically test the ET predictions regarding relationships among the four types of goal pursuit (Constitutive, Instrumental, Individual, and Shared) and two types of well-being (EWB and HWB).

Aristotle emphasized that human flourishing was only possible through the active pursuit of excellence. ET posits that two dimensions of goal pursuit, Agency and Communion, contribute to EWB and HWB (Fowers, 2012, 2015; Owenz & Fowers, 2010).

**The Agency Dimension of the human good.** The Agency Dimension refers to the relationship between means (or goal focused actions) and ends (or goals) and includes Instrumental and Constitutive Forms of Goal Pursuit. Instrumental Goals are goals that can be pursued with a variety of means to achieve the end goal. Wealth is an example of an instrumental goal because it can be achieved in many ways, such as hard work, innovation, bank robbery, or inheritance. The belief that all human actions are driven by a means-ends rationale can contribute to many socially problematic actions, including taking an exploitative stance toward and becoming isolated from others, the environment, and the world (Fowers, 2012) because one is led to see other people and the environment as mere means to one’s ends.

While instrumentalism is pervasive in psychological theory, several authors provide alternative descriptions of human motivation (e.g., Dunne, 1993; Fowers, 2005; Guignon, 1993; Ryan & Deci, 2000). ET critiques this exclusive means-ends
approach and provides an alternative in which one’s actions toward a goal constitute the ends. Fowers (2010) termed this Constitutive Goal Pursuit. Constitutive Goals are those in which the means and ends are inseparable. Aristotle (1999) concisely described the constitutive-ends activities as “those from which we seek to derive nothing beyond the actual exercise of the activity” (p. 286). For instance, an artist may have the goal of showing his or her paintings in galleries, a potentially instrumental pursuit of money or fame. However, a painter’s life is dedicated to learning, growing, and creating as an artist, which is a life focused on painting as an activity as much as on paintings as outcomes or on the money to be earned. Thus, continuous meaningful actions lead toward the overarching Constitutive Goal of being an artist.

Eudaimonia is by its nature a constitutive goal, a life committed to the ongoing pursuit of goals consistent with one’s best understanding of a good life. Recent structural equation modeling studies (Fowers et al., 2010a; Winakur, 2011) support Fowers’ (2005) contention that a Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit (actions) mediates the relationship between Constitutive Goal Orientation and EWB. Further, these studies found that an instrumental mode of goal pursuit (actions) mediates the relationship between Instrumental Goal Orientation and HWB. Although the body of ET literature is relatively small, research consistently indicates that Instrumental and Constitutive Goal Pursuits are coexisting orientations toward pursuing important goals. This study will add to the literature regarding how Instrumental and Constitutive Goal Pursuits relate to HWB and EWB by examining these goal
orientations in combination with the goal orientations contained in the Communion Dimension of ET.

**Communion Dimension and the human good.** Communion is a lesser-known dimension of ET that distinguishes between individual and shared goals (e.g., Fowers, 2005, 2012, 2015). Individual goals refer to goals that may be pursued and attained by the individual. Most goals research focuses only on individual goals, neglecting shared goals. Research indicates that HWB increases with perceived goal progress toward and attainment of individual goals (e.g., Carver & Scheier, 1990, 1999), as well as perceived competence and confidence (e.g., Brunstein, Schultheiss, & Grässman, 1998; McGregor & Little, 1998; Ryan & Deci, 2001).

The focus on individual goals is one way that many psychologists evidence an underlying bias toward individualism, as many have critiqued (e.g., Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985; Fowers, 2005, 2012; Richardson & Fowers, 1998). “Individualism takes the individual to be the ultimate social reality and views the autonomous pursuit and satisfaction of individually defined ends as the ultimate good in life” (Fowers, 2012, p. 2). Although important to our understanding of why people choose and pursue individually meaningful goals by themselves, individualism misses irreducibly communal aspects of human action. Although there are exceptions to this overall trend, as noted above, it is common in psychology to hold the individualistic perspective on human motivation, which is problematic because it can blind many in the field to the importance of vital forms of interpersonal activity.

ET provides a unique way to transcend individualism. It posits shared goals, which are those that may not be individually possessed or attained (e.g., friendship,
justice, and intimacy). The only way to achieve a shared goal is to have it in common with others. ET suggests that shared goals “contain and supersede” (Fowers, 2012, p. 15) individual goals. For example, individual rights are only possible through the shared goal of creating and maintaining a society that honors those rights. Emerging findings thus suggest that the communal aspects of goal pursuit are linked to EWB and warrant further investigation (e.g., Mollica, 2008; Owenz & Fowers, 2010; Procacci, 2008).

**Research Questions**

A recent influx in well-being and goals research has added to our understanding of these themes. However, it is clear that extant well-being and goals research overlooks Aristotle’s (1999) key distinctions of goal directed activity that he claimed were related to the good life (Fowers, 2012, 2015). This study will expand the goal pursuit and well-being research beyond pervasive, hidden assumptions of hedonism, instrumentalism, and individualism often found within this body of research. It will enrich psychological theory and research by directly studying important distinctions in goal pursuit and well-being that most research obscures through attempts at value-neutrality.

ET predicts that Constitutive and Shared Goal Pursuit are particularly strongly related to EWB. ET also predicts that goal pursuit that is both Constitutive and Shared will result in the highest degree of EWB. Therefore, the primary research question is the following: *Does the interaction of Constitutive and Shared Goal Pursuit relate to higher EWB?* While matched with the theory and suggested by past research, this question has not yet been empirically tested.
In contrast, ET predicts that Instrumental and Individual Goal Pursuit have positive relationships to HWB. In addition, ET predicts that the combination of Instrumental and Individual Goal Pursuit will result in the highest degree of HWB.

The second research question is the following: *Does the interaction of Instrumental and Individual Goal Pursuit predict HWB?* Although, predicted by ET and guided by past research, the present study will be the first to empirically test this question.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This review begins with an introduction to Eudaimonic Theory (Fowers, 2012), the framework guiding this study. This is followed by a review of the well-being literature. The next section provides a general review of the goal pursuit literature. This is followed by a review of the literature and research on Agentic and Communal Dimensions of Goal Pursuit. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the literature, and a new set of ET hypotheses regarding goal type and goal orientations is presented.

Eudaimonic Theory

Aristotle (1999) posited that the aim of human life should be a good life, which he referred to as eudaimonia. In recent years, psychologists and philosophers have shown increased interest in viewing well-being through the lens of eudaimonia (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2001; Fowers, 2005, 2012; Huta & Waterman, 2014; Ryff, 1989; Vittersø, Oelmann, & Wang, 2009). Yet, there are disagreements about the definition of eudaimonia, which proves problematic to its study. Eudaimonia researchers often vary in how closely they tie their definition of eudaimonia to Aristotelian philosophy, and lack a consensus definition of eudaimonia (Fowers, 2012). Although it is often directly translated as “happiness,” this can be a cause for confusion as it fails to account for the vast differences in how happiness has been defined over time.

ET (Fowers, 2005) provides a rich and increasingly comprehensive theory that is conceptualized through goal pursuit. Aristotle believed that humans flourish when they lead virtuous lives and pursue activities aimed at goals that are worth achieving. He argued that the ultimate goal is realizing one’s highest potential as a human being.
ET provides an organized description of the key facets of the complex concept of eudaimonia. The following sections explain five key facets of eudaimonia.

From the first paragraph of *The Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle (1999) clarified that eudaimonia is an activity, in contrast to a subjective state, such as satisfaction. Aristotle suggested that flourishing is constituted by high quality, characteristic activities. So, although a person could make positive affect a major life goal, from an ET perspective this would fall short of a life of flourishing because no amount of subjective pleasure could constitute eudaimonia.

Second, Aristotle consistently connected the good life to realizing one’s natural potential, a concept known as the function argument. Aristotle (1999) stated “all things that have a function (ergon) or activity, the good and the ‘well’ is thought to reside in the function” (pp. 26-27). This natural fulfillment perspective on human functioning suggests that humans live well when they actively and rationally pursue goals that are consistent with human characteristics, abilities, and interests. Later in this chapter, I will introduce a eudaimonic goal hierarchy based on the function argument and other aspects of eudaimonic theory.

Third, eudaimonia is comprised of a well-orchestrated set of human goals, such as justice and friendship, which are reached through habitual behavior the individual considers purposive (Aristotle, 1999). Aristotle believed that eudaimonia is reached through habitual patterns of excellence, which are motivated by a desire to reach a worthwhile goal. While Aristotle did not prescribe specific goals, he viewed many human higher-order goals as essential to flourishing, including justice, friendship, and knowledge. For this reason, ET views eudaimonia as a broad, nonprescriptive path,
which embodies important aspects of human life. Therefore, ET views eudaimonia as a multi-faceted construct, which can only be studied as such.

Fourth, belonging and close relationships are essential to eudaimonia. Aristotle (1999) believed that "no one would choose to live without friends even if he had all the other goods" (pp. 5-6). Friendship is so essential to Aristotle’s conception of flourishing that two of the 10 chapters of the *Nicomachean Ethics* are devoted to friendship. Aristotle viewed humans as a social species and saw shared goal pursuits such as friendship as essential to flourishing. For instance, friendship can only be achieved when two people act as friends (e.g., supporting one another, enjoying each other’s company). In order to account for the importance of collective pursuits, ET’s Communion Dimension differentiates between individual and shared goals and their related actions. I describe this distinction more fully below.

Lastly, Aristotle (1999) stated that “eudaimonia is at once the best, noblest, and most pleasant thing and these qualities are not separate” (p. 21), which clarifies that eudaimonia is innately pleasant and worthwhile in and of itself. Aristotle asserted that eudaimonia is the highest end (goal) because there is not anything that an individual could pursue above a flourishing life. Aristotle made it clear that “there is a difference between pleasures that come from noble sources and pleasures that come from base sources” (p. 278), indicating that eudaimonia is a qualitatively different type of enjoyment from bodily pleasure. A flourishing person finds pleasure in excellent activity. For example, artists pursue art because they view it as inherently valuable and worthy of dedicated activity, which can make the pursuit pleasurable. These types of goals, in which the ends constitute the means (constitutive goals), are not simply
obligations or laborious chores. Undoubtedly, eudaimonia differs from the hedonic pleasure derived from drinking daiquiris on the beach, which, while temporarily enjoyable, lacks deeper meaning. In contrast, ET differentiates between two types of goal pursuit and specifies that the pursuit of personally meaningful goals includes inherent pleasure. As constitutive goals are so central to Aristotle’s conceptualization of flourishing, I will assess the ways which participants pursue their important goals and how this relates to eudaimonic well-being.

Eudaimonia is a multifaceted concept, which has led to confusion trying to define it. ET provides a clear, theoretically driven definition of eudaimonia as “a life comprised of actions that are worthwhile in themselves because they are devoted to characteristically human goods, and pursued with excellence or virtue and within collaborative and meaningful relationships” (Fowers, et al., 2010a, p. 139). Later in this chapter, a hierarchical structure of eudaimonia and ways it can be studied will be provided. Aristotle understood eudaimonia as a fully realized human life. Therefore, I refer to eudaimonia and flourishing synonymously.

Scholars have debated the translation of philosophical eudaimonia into a psychological construct of eudaimonia (Henderson & Knight, 2012). Kashdan, Biswas-Diener, and King (2008) argued that Aristotle’s philosophical definition of eudaimonia was inappropriate for psychological science on the grounds that it includes inherent moral judgments. They also indicated that the distinction between eudaimonia and hedonia was neither empirically supported nor helpful, suggesting that research support for such a distinction could conversely be taken as evidence that eudaimonia and hedonia were one construct. Many scholars responded in
disagreement with Kashdan et al. Contemporary psychologists, such as Fowers (2015), have argued that in the practical world of empirical investigations, eudaimonia is no more value-laden than hedonia because both constructs tend to be measured in the same ways, through self-report measures and Likert style questions. Therefore, for the purposes of this dissertation, Kashdan et al.’s criticism loses its force.

Despite these disagreements, many psychologists appear to accept and embrace the distinction between eudaimonia and hedonia (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2001; Huta & Waterman, 2014; Vittersø, & Søholt, 2011). Yet eudaimonia researchers often lack consensus about how to conceptualize, define, and measure eudaimonia (e.g., Huta & Waterman, 2014). Although Aristotelian scholars disagree on multiple aspects of eudaimonia, there are several definitional features of eudaimonia that are agreed upon (Fowers, 2012), which have been incorporated into ET.

**Hierarchy of the good life.** Throughout the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1999), Aristotle posited distinctions between hedonia and eudaimonia, with eudaimonia as the peak of human functioning. Hedonia refers to experiences that are fleeting, affective forms of pleasure that for some include experiences such as the excitement and joy of jumping on a trampoline. Conversely, eudaimonia refers to deeper, more meaningful experiences aligned with actively pursuing what is good. Aristotle (1999) distinguished hedonia and eudaimonia, stating the following:

The good of man is an activity of the soul in conformity with excellence or virtue . . . but we must add "in a complete life." For one swallow does not make a spring, nor does one sunny day; similarly, one day or a short time does not make a
man blessed and eudaimon. (pp. 17-18)

Some degree of hedonia is certainly worth experiencing, but pleasurable or affective experiences by themselves are insufficient for flourishing. ET views a life dedicated to experiencing hedonic, bodily pleasures and a life dedicated to flourishing through eudaimonic activities as both inherently related and distinguishable, as I describe in the next section. Consistent with Aristotle, ET views eudaimonia as hierarchically superior to hedonia.

**Well-Being**

Eudaimonia and hedonia are concepts that are very difficult to study in a direct, empirical manner, so social scientists often examine them empirically through self-report well-being measures (e.g., Deci & Ryan 2008; Fowers et al., 2010; Keyes, et al., 2002). Hedonic well-being is assessed in terms of simple pleasure, positive affect, and life satisfaction. Hallmarks of eudaimonic well-being are experiencing meaning, purpose, personal growth, and positive relationships. Aristotle’s distinction between eudaimonia and hedonia has been reinforced by contemporary research indicating that HWB is associated with but is empirically distinct from eudaimonic well-being (EWB) (Compton, et al, 1996; Huta & Ryan, 2010; Keyes et al., 2002; McGregor & Little, 1998; Owenz, Winakur, & Fowers, 2010). ET distinguishes between HWB and EWB. While ET reasons that EWB is an indicator of eudaimonia, and HWB is an indicator of hedonia, it is understood that they are very imperfect representations. Tables 1-3 contain brief definitions of the study’s well-being and good life constructs.

**Hedonic well-being.** HWB is understood as a subjective form of well-being focused “on happiness and defines well-being in terms of pleasure attainment and
pain avoidance” (Ryan & Deci, 2001, p. 141). HWB is an individual’s self-evaluation of his or her level of happiness as related to mood as well as overall satisfaction with life (Diener, 2000). The affective portion of HWB includes positive affect and relatively low negative affect. Satisfaction with life is an individual’s assessment of how close his or her life comes to meeting that individual's ideals (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).

Well-being researchers commonly use goal pursuit as a predictor of HWB (e.g., Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005; Pychtal & Ryan, 1998). Studies of goals and HWB suggest that pursuing intrinsic goals and perceived progress toward goals are related to higher HWB (e.g., Brunstein, 1993; Deci & Ryan, 2001). A recent meta-analysis of 85 studies found a significant relationship between successful goal attainment and hedonic well-being (Klug & Maier, 2015). Research has shown that when people are highly committed to their goals, it increases satisfaction with life while improving coping and reducing stress (Cantor & Sanderson, 1999). Control theory research indicates that "fast enough" progress toward important goals is related to HWB (e.g., Carver & Scheier, 1990). Some have found that goal achievement, regardless of the goal content, robustly predicts happiness (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Emmons, 1986), while others report that intrinsically valued goals contribute to well-being whereas extrinsically valued goals detract from well-being (Sheldon & Kasser, 1998).

While certainly an important aspect of well-being, HWB has been criticized as a shallow measure of quality of life. Procacci (2008) argued that “positive affect is transitory in nature and therefore, a less stable and comprehensive indicator of quality
of life. As such, measures of hedonic well-being have been thought to lack the depth required to capture psychological well-being in its totality” (p 16). This perspective suggests that a model of well-being must include more than hedonic indicators.

**Eudaimonic well-being.** ET conceptualizes EWB as a stable experience that emerges from actively and constitutively pursuing personally meaningful goals. ET favors the interpretation of eudaimonia as an enduring way of life, in contrast to a short-lived pursuit. EWB is conceptualized as more meaningful and deeper than HWB.

Ryff (1989) was among the first to attempt researching EWB, as she viewed subjective well-being (another term for HWB) as an inadequate concept of well-being. She constructed a model of Psychological Well-Being (Ryff & Singer, 2008) by drawing from Aristotle and the humanistic psychology, clinical psychology, and developmental psychology literatures. The PWB model includes six dimensions: Purpose in Life, Environmental Mastery, Self-Acceptance, Autonomy, Personal Growth, and Positive Relationships with Others. While she viewed all six dimensions as related to eudaimonia, she stated that "the two most eudaimonic aspects of well-being" (Ryff, 1989, p. 27) are Personal Growth and Purpose in Life. ET also considers the Positive Relationships with Others dimension as theoretically central to EWB. Previous research findings confirmed that Positive Relationships with Others, Personal Growth and Purpose in Life are good indicators of EWB (Fowers et al., 2010; Winakur, 2011).

Fowers, et al. (2010a) conducted a factor analytic study of EWB measures, which investigated three hypotheses stemming from ET and contemporary EWB theory:
EWB (a) is a multifaceted construct, (b) that can be modeled as a second order latent variable, and (c) with first order latent variable components such as purpose, meaning, personal growth, strong relationships with others, and deep commitment. EWB was assessed with the most prominent contemporary measures of EWB, including three scales of PWB (i.e., Personal Growth, Positive Relationships with Others, and Purpose in Life; Ryff, 1989), the Orientations to Happiness Scale (OHS; Peterson, Park & Seligman, 2005), and the Questionnaire for Eudaimonic Well-Being (QE WB; Waterman et al., 2010). An exploratory factor analysis of responses from 659 undergraduate participants resulted in a five-factor model of EWB, which included one factor compromised solely of reverse-scored items. The reverse-scored item factor was problematic due to a consistent and prominent skew in participant responses, indicating that participants generally did not agree with negative statements regarding personal growth and purpose in life. Further, the negative item factor was defined methodologically rather than theoretically, which further led the researchers to question the appropriateness of the factor in the model. After careful consideration of whether it was wise to include reverse scored items, the researchers explored the elimination of this factor and concluded that a four-factor model with first order latent variables of meaning, personal growth, relational giving, and relational benefits was a good fit and EWB as the second order factor.

Fowers et al. (2013) also conducted confirmatory factor analyses of eudaimonic well-being indicators. This study indicated that Meaning, Personal Growth, and Deep Commitment were indicators of the latent variable of EWB. Given the theoretical and empirical support for this EWB latent construct, it is employed in the present study.
The following section serves to extend this line of inquiry by providing a review of the current literature on how well-being relates to gender.

**ET and gender.** There is some evidence of gender differences for all three indicators of EWB: Purpose in Life, Personal Growth and Positive Relations with Others (Ferguson & Gunnell, 2016). The majority of research indicates that gender is a poor predictor of Personal Growth (e.g., Ryff et al., 2003). However, a recent study revealed gender differences in terms of quantity of Personal Growth Goals, with a higher proportion among women than men (Seaton & Beaumont, 2015). Waterman (2004) also reported a small but significant gender difference in the quantity of activities deemed personally expressive. Women more often report at least one personally expressive activity, which may be related to level of EWB. These mixed findings suggest that Personal Growth may be related to gender.

In terms of Purpose in Life, women have higher scores than men (Perez, 2012; Vleioras & Bosma, 2005). Because much of this research has been conducted with college students, Lenroot et al. (2007) explained that these differences could be characterized by patterns of brain development, “as achieving a sense of purpose requires mental maturity and women tend to reach full brain development maturity earlier than men” (Ferguson & Gunnell, 2016, p. 431).

The Positive Relationships with Others component of EWB has the most unambiguous research findings to support gender differences. Research suggests that it is more likely for women to have a relational orientation than men (e.g., Cross & Madson, 1997; Taylor et al., 2000). Consistently, women report more Positive Relations with Others in comparison to men (Ahrens & Ryff, 2006; Perez, 2012;
Ryff, 1989, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 2002; Vleioras & Bosma, 2005). Positive Relations with Others is the lowest rated EWB indicator for men (Ryff & Singer, 2002), in contrast to qualitative reports from men, which indicated that relating with others is an essential part of their conceptualization of optimal functioning. Some have suggested that these gender differences can be explained by human development, as female development tends to be more focused on relationships than is male development (e.g., Boardman, Blalock & Button, 2008; Ryff, 1989).

Gender differences have been found in aspects of HWB as well. For instance, research indicates that women experience higher rates of negative affect and depression than men (e.g., Nydegger, 2004; Russo & Green, 1993). Although more limited, some studies have found that men experience higher rates of life satisfaction and positive affect than women (e.g., Schmotkin, 1990). These gender differences suggest that in the present study, men might report higher HWB and women may report higher EWB.

**ET and goal pursuit**

One approach to understanding human behavior that psychologists often study is personal goals. As flourishing only emerges through goal-directed activity, ET utilizes goal pursuit as an important contributor to well-being. Goals are mental representations of desirable and attainable end states that one intends to achieve through action (e.g., Kruglanski, 1996). Means are the actions used to facilitate goal progress and attainment. It is commonly understood that people have numerous goals, each potentially served by a variety of means (e.g., Orehek & Vazeou-Nieuwenhuis, 2013).
As previously discussed, the majority of goals and well-being research has focused on an individualistic, instrumental, and hedonic conceptualization of well-being (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2008; Diener, 2000; Fowers, 2012; Huta & Waterman, 2014). In recent years, many psychologists have gained an interest in a more meaningful understanding of the good life and contributed to its research. They have studied self-determination (e.g., Ryan & Deci, 2000), integrity (McGregor & Little, 1998), social well-being (Keyes, 1998), and meaning (McGregor & Little, 1998). This research has enriched and broadened the literature, informing the development of ET; however, these researchers have not provided a theory-driven approach consistent with Aristotle’s conceptualization of eudaimonia.

ET has enriched the literature by both recognizing the problems associated with a hedonic, instrumental, and individualistic conceptualization of well-being and developing an Aristotelian theory of well-being. ET provides a multidimensional framework of human action (goal pursuit) and a research agenda, which directly addresses the aforementioned problems.

**Dimensions of goal pursuit**

ET posits two dimensions of goal pursuit, which distinguishes between *how* goals are sought and *who* is essential in goal pursuit. These two dimensions are referred to as Agency and Communion, respectively (e.g., Fowers, 2012). The Agency Dimension focuses on the how of goal pursuit, specifically the relationship between the means and ends of goal pursuit. The Communion Dimension focuses on the who of goal pursuit, distinguishing between individual goals, which can be sought and attained by the individual, and shared goals, which can only be pursued and achieved
in concert with others. The following sections provide greater detail on the Agency and Communion Dimensions, as well as their internal hierarchies (see Tables 1-3 for definitions).

**Agency Dimension.** The Agency Dimension is composed of two types of goals: Instrumental Goals, in which the means and end are separable, and Constitutive Goals, in which the means constitute the goal (the means and ends are inseparable). There are three major distinctions between Instrumental and Constitutive Goal Pursuit (Fowers, 2010). First, Constitutive Actions either partially or fully realize the end goal or are inseparable from the end goal (Wiggins, 1979). Constitutive Actions constitute the goal itself, whereas Instrumental Actions can be swapped out based on effectiveness or enjoyment. The pursuit of money, for instance, is necessary to meet one’s basic needs. Wealth can be achieved through hard work, luck, inheritance, or thievery, so it is instrumentally pursued. In contrast, the goal of being a scholar can only be pursued by doing the things a scholar does: reading, writing, listening, constructing ideas, receiving feedback, editing one's work, and so forth. Being a scholar is a clear example of a constitutive goal because the only way to achieve it is through scholarly activity. Guignon (1993) stated that while certain behaviors will appear similar whether the actions are instrumental or constitutive in nature, the quality of the activity would differ. For instance, Instrumental Activity often becomes a tiresome chore that an individual would quickly abandon if a better means to the end existed. Antithetically, Constitutive Actions are considered valuable and meaningful because the activity is consistent with the way an individual wants to live their life.
Second, Constitutive Actions are inherently valuable because they cannot be separated from their Constitutive Goal. Unlike Constitutive Actions, Instrumental Actions are only as valuable as their usefulness in achieving an end goal and do not have value in and of themselves. For example, the goal of being a good parent is constitutive because acting as a good parent by teaching, protecting, and loving constitutes the goal itself.

Third, it is impossible to separate a person’s character from his or her constitutive activity because constitutive actions play a role in constituting a person’s identity and life. For instance, people constitute themselves as teachers by learning to instruct and guide students because these are activities that make teachers valuable. In contrast, a person’s character can be separated from his or her instrumental activity. For example, the instrumental action of driving at breakneck speed to keep one’s job by arriving on time does not make that person a race car driver. Clearly, there are many differences between Instrumental and Constitutive Goal Pursuit, which are further explained through hierarchical divisions in the next section.

**Hierarchy of the Agentic Dimension.** ET clearly indicates an Agentic Hierarchy favoring Constitutive Goal Pursuit over Instrumental Goal Pursuit. Instrumental Goals are useful and necessary. However, if a person pursued only instrumental goals, that person would constantly be pursuing means to an end, none of which are inherently valuable. As Aristotle (1999) stated, a purely instrumental life “would be futile and pointless” (p. 4). A life of Constitutive Goal Pursuit is consistent with eudaimonia because “flourishing is defined as a way of life that is worthwhile in itself” (Fowers et al., 2010, p. 140). In addition, instrumental goals provide the
infrastructure that makes Constitutive Goal Pursuit possible. For example, seeking moderate financial resources (an instrumental goal) makes it possible to pursue knowledge and justice (constitutive goals).

One critique of the Agency Dimension is that some goal pursuits may not fit neatly into either the Instrumental or Constitutive Goal Type. In a qualitative goal pursuit study (Fowers, Cohen, Lang, Winakur, & Owenz, 2014), many participants shared that the same goals can be pursued with different goal orientation. For instance, the goal of “getting my master’s degree,” could be pursued instrumentally or constitutively. Education is viewed as an outcome or “hoop” when it is instrumentally pursued. Viewing a master’s degree as part of becoming an educated person would make it a constitutive goal. Language also plays an important role in understanding goal orientation. Many participants spoke in instrumental terms without meaning that they held a view that their goal was instrumental in nature. Some goals may be both instrumental and constitutive in nature. For example, being a concert pianist can be viewed both as constitutive to the goal of being a pianist and as instrumental in providing the financial means to pay a mortgage. While the Agency Dimension may not perfectly describe all goals, ET allows us to understand individuals who are oriented toward many goals and how those goals can be pursued through recognizable modalities.

Communion Dimension. The lesser-known dimension of ET is the Communion Dimension, which is focused on who is needed to pursue a goal and who attains the goal. It differentiates between goal related activity that can be pursued solely by the individual (individual goals) and goals that can only be pursued with other people
(shared goals). This section describes individual goal orientation and shared goal orientation and explains why they are central to flourishing within ET.

Individual goals are desired outcomes that can be attained or possessed by the individual. Examples of individual goals include achievement, money, status, and pleasure. While other people may be involved with individual goals, other people are not strictly necessary for goal attainment or possession. Only an individual can appropriately pursue individual goals. Perhaps the most topical example of an individual goal is the completion of a doctoral dissertation, which by its very nature must be pursued first and foremost by the author. At times, people working toward individual goals can unsuitably rely on the support of others. Important people in the author’s life, such as her family, research mentor, or committee, may provide support and help but that does not make the goal a shared goal. While important people in the author’s life may provide feedback and encouragement, if the author works toward his or her dissertation with high Shared Goal Orientation, that person will end up, at the very least, disappointed and disillusioned. The completion of a dissertation is a demonstration of individual competence as indicated by sole authorship and the corresponding single name on the conferred doctoral degree.

ET recognizes that individual goals are necessary and important both for individuals and relationships. Individual goal attainment relates to positive subjective experiences, such as satisfaction. However, ET researchers believe that individual goals are inadequate in describing some of the most important goals in relationships. Some scholars have persuasively reasoned that the focus on individual goals in well-being and marital quality research misses the mark by overlooking the richness of

Shared goals, in contrast to individual goals, can only be pursued and attained through ongoing involvement in communal activities. Shared goals are, by their very nature, collective accomplishments. Common shared goals include peace, teamwork, justice, friendship, and intimacy. Shared goals are among the most meaningful and valued ends people pursue. In addition, "the idea of shared goods (goals) makes it clear that in some crucial respects, what is good for me is inseparable from what is good for others" (Fowers, 2005, p. 86).

It is essential that shared goals are pursued appropriately, that is in concert with others. For instance, the goal of having a good marriage relies on both partners actively working together to enrich and maintain their relationship. In contrast, if only one spouse regularly and actively works on the relationship (e.g., trying to communicate effectively and spending quality time together), the goal is unlikely to be met. It is also likely to be very frustrating and even hurtful for the partner who is making the effort, thus conflicting with the goal of a good marriage even more. When both partners actively and regularly pursue a good relationship, they succeed through a combination of constitutive and shared goal pursuit. Shared goals can only be achieved by working together and are possessed by all of the people working toward the goal.

**Shared Goal Orientation.** From a goal orientation perspective, an individual’s thoughts and behaviors are organized around his or her important goals (e.g., Dweck, 1996). Shared Goal Orientation refers to the degree to which a person believes that
his or her “particular goal can only be pursued and accomplished with others and cannot be divided up or competed for such as friendship or teamwork” (Procacci, 2008, p. 105). Fowers, Mollica and Procacci (2007) developed the Shared Goal Orientation scale, which asks respondents the degree to which each of their idiographic goals were shared in nature. Although Shared Goal Orientation research is limited, preliminary findings indicate that Shared Goal Orientation may play an important role in HWB and EWB (Owenz et al., 2010). This concept will be elaborated upon later in the introduction to new ET hypotheses.

**Hierarchy of the Communion Dimension.** Shared Goal Pursuit has a key role in human flourishing and is hierarchically superior to individual goal pursuit. Everyone has individual goals, and they are an important part of life, but ET posits that one way to distinguish a satisfying life from a flourishing life is that the latter will have more shared goals. ET views a Shared Goal Orientation as a necessary part of human flourishing. Aristotle (1999) stated that the “highest good is justice, in other words the common interest” (p. 15), which can be illustrated through the example of politics (Fowers, 2012).

In the contemporary U.S., there is a tendency to overemphasize the individual aspects of politics (e.g., equal rights and freedom), which are insufficient in and of themselves to order society because shared goals, such as justice and democracy, are necessary for individual freedoms to be possible. A single person cannot successfully pursue the rule of law if others did not also do so. In order for a rule of law to work, citizens (at least for the most part) must share the goal and pursue it together, continuously. ET classifies shared goals as “hierarchically superordinate to individual
goals” because shared goals “both contain and supersede individual” goals (Fowers, 2012, p. 5).

**Bi-dimensional structure of goal pursuit and well-being**

ET (Fowers, 2012) conceptualizes goal pursuit as forming a two-dimensional goal space (see Table 4), with the Communion Dimension (Individual Goals and Shared Goals) intersecting with the Agency Dimension (Instrumental Goals and Constitutive Goals). The theory suggests that individual goals pursued instrumentally relate more strongly with HWB and that shared goals pursued constitutively relate most strongly with EWB. The present study will be the first to test these relationships.

**Agentic structure.** Early research into the relationship between Agentic variables and well-being supports ET. Fowers et al. (2010) utilized the ET model to explore the relationship between the two Agentic Orientations toward Goal Pursuit (Instrumental and Constitutive) and two forms of well-being (HWB and EWB). Similar to previous studies, EWB and HWB were distinct variables, although they were correlated. The researchers hypothesized two Agentic pathways of well-being. Their results supported the Instrumental Path Model in which Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit (comprised by fun and challenge) mediated the relationship between Instrumental Goal Orientation and HWB. Similarly, the Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit (composed of integrity and personal expression) mediated the relationship between Constitutive Goal Orientation and EWB. Consistent with ET, these findings suggest that congruency between Agentic Orientation and Agentic Modes of Goal Pursuit have significant correlations with theoretically matched forms of well-being. Winakur, Owenz, and Fowers (2010) replicated this study.
**Communal structure.** When it comes to shared goals, it is essential that these are pursued appropriately, that is, in concert with others. When only one person pursues a shared goal, the individual is very unlikely to succeed. For instance, the goal of having a good marriage relies on both partners actively working together toward this obviously shared goal. In contrast, only an individual can appropriately pursue individual goals. For example, the pursuit of a doctoral dissertation is by its very nature an individual goal, to be pursued primarily by the author.

Owenz et al. (2010) investigated the relationships between ET’s Communion Dimension of goal pursuit and well-being. They hypothesized that appropriate congruence between Shared Goal Orientation (high vs. low) and Communal Goal Type (Interpersonal vs. Individual) would relate to well-being for their sample of emerging adult, college undergraduates. Whereas the term “shared goal” is a theoretical construct, the term “Interpersonal Goal” is used solely in goal assessment to instruct participants to select goals that include other people. Thus, Interpersonal Goals are differentiated from Individual Goals, which do not include others. Owenz et al. (2010) conducted a structural equation model of goal congruency between Shared Goal Orientation (high vs. low) and Communal Goal Type (Individual Goal vs. Interpersonal Goal), as it related to the latent variables of HWB and EWB. They found that emerging adults who appropriately differentiated and pursued Interpersonal Goals in concert with a Shared Goal Orientation reported higher EWB and HWB, whereas individuals who pursued Individual Goals with a Shared Goal Orientation had lower EWB and HWB. Similarly, participants who pursued Individual Goals with a low degree of Shared Goal Orientation had higher EWB and
HWB. I use the term Communal Goal Congruence to describe this theoretically appropriate congruence of Shared Goal Orientation and goals that are pursued with other people. The findings also support ET’s Communal Dimension framework by showing that the Communal Goal Congruence of both low Shared Goal Orientation combined with Individual Goals and high Shared Goal Orientation combined with Interpersonal Goals hold independent importance for well-being. For instance, low Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals works well, whereas having high Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals does not work well. Similarly, having high Shared Goal Orientation toward Interpersonal Goals works well, whereas low Shared Goal Orientation toward Interpersonal Goals does not. Owenz et al. (2010) suggested that ET is a useful lens to understand the relationship between the Communion Dimension of Goal Pursuit and well-being. Although research in this area is limited, the important findings of this study have been replicated (Owenz et al., 2010). The proposed study will serve to replicate and expand upon these findings using new ET hypotheses that follow from the Eudaimonic Goal Hierarchy.

In recent years, there has been an influx in goal congruence (or concordance) research, which focuses on the appropriate match between different aspects of goal pursuit such as goal type, values, interests, motives, and orientations (e.g., Job & Brandstätter, 2009). For instance, in a daily-diary study of students, Brunstein, Schultheiss, and Grässman (1998) reported that goal progress toward motive-congruent goals, in comparison to motive-incongruent goals, related to higher self-reported emotional well-being. In contrast, research indicates that the pursuit of implicit motive-incongruent goals is related to more psychophysiological complaints
(Baumann, Kaschel, & Kuhl, 2005) and lower satisfaction with life (Hofer & Chasiotis, 2003). This research suggests that goal congruence is desirable because it plays an important role in a person’s hedonic and physical well-being. The proposed study will be the first to utilize goal congruence in relation to ET by combining assessments of Agentic and Communal Goals.

ET and culture

It is possible that relations among the constructs of ET may differ across cultures. For decades, it has been presumed that goal desirability is informed by culturally predominant values and motives (Benedict, 1934). In general, people from different cultures are attracted to different goals. Often cultures are described as individualistic or collectivistic in nature (e.g., Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988). In individualistic cultures, the primary focus is on the goals of the individual. In collectivistic cultures, the focus is generally on the good and the future of the group (e.g., family, community). In general, members of individualistic cultures select goals with themes such as social independence, personal achievement, and efficacy. In contrast, members of collectivist cultures tend to pursue goals that are focused on social interdependence, social harmony, and achieving ingroup goals (Hofstede, 2001; Oishi & Diener, 2001; Triandis, 1989). While culture critics have argued that individualistic and collectivistic cultural differences are too general (e.g., Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002), individualistic and collectivistic cultural backgrounds may play a role in goal pursuit for participants of the present study. Perhaps members of individualistic cultures are more likely to have lower shared goal orientation than members of collectivistic cultures.
Familism is one of many family-related concepts found to be prevalent in collectivist cultures in which loyalty and strong identification with one's immediate and extended family is valued (Lopez, 2011) and the needs of the family are prioritized above the needs of any individual (e.g., Abdou et al., 2010; Gaines et al., 1997). Familism is more prevalent in Latino and Asian cultures. Latino familism, or familismo, strongly emphasizes the importance of easily accessible social support and positive emotional tone (Campos et al., 2008; Sabogal, Marín, Otero-Sabogal, Marín, & Perez-Stable, 1987; Updegraff, McHale, Whiteman, Thayer, & Delgado, 2005). Asian filial piety emphasizes the importance of demonstrations of respect toward elders based on hierarchical obedience (Ho, 1994; Yeh & Bedford, 2004). Although familism was not directly measured in the present study, perhaps participants from Latino cultures will differ in Shared Goal Orientation in comparison to non-Latino participants.

Familism has been linked to subjective well-being (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2010) and prosocial behavior (e.g., Calderón-Tena, Knight, & Carlo, 2011), which are theoretically related to the positive relations with others component of EWB. However, familism has also been linked to distress (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2010). Latinos often report greater familism than Asian and European participants (e.g., Campos, Ullman, Aguilera & Dunkel Schetter, 2014). Although familism was not directly measured in the present study, the large Latino component in the sample set allows for an examination of how Latino familism may play a role in goal pursuit and well-being. Research indicates that familism has an indirect effect on superior psychological health as measured by general mental health, depressive symptoms,
and perceived stress, through greater perceived social support and greater closeness to family members (Campos et al., 2014). Perhaps Latino participants will differ from other cultural groups in well-being as it relates to Shared Goal Orientation.

The Agency Dimension and Shared Goal Orientation share similarities with German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies’s (2001) conceptualization of human will and motivation (Wesenwille and Kürwille), as well as their related social cultures (Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft). In Tönnies’s analysis, Wesenwille refers to “natural will,” in which a person views his or her actions as essential to the goals of the community. For instance, Wesenwille toward volunteering time to help others or good citizenship in a democracy can only be achieved through good citizenship. This appears related to Constitutive Goal Pursuit. Wesenwille is related to Gemeinschaft, which translates as community and refers to associations in which people are oriented toward the whole group equally, if not beyond their own self-interest. These relationships are best characterized by close-knit neighborhoods or families. Gemeinschaft appears related to high Shared Goal Pursuit.

In contrast, Kürwille, which is often translated as “arbitrary will,” occurs when an individual sees social goals as simply means to individual goals. Kürwille is related to membership in social groups that are sustained by some instrumental goal known as Gesellschaft, which translates into society. Examples of Gesellschaft include a nation or business. These concepts appear related to Instrumental Goal Pursuit and low Shared Goal Orientation.

The ET Dimensions of Agency and Communion appear to relate to conceptualizations about culture. As the participants were students in culturally
diverse South Florida, there may be cultural differences in Agency and Communion related to culture. This will be the first study to explore the relationship between ET and culture.

**Eudaimonic Goal Hierarchy Hypotheses**

I propose new eudaimonic goal hierarchy hypotheses stemming from Eudaimonic Theory. ET suggests that appropriate fit between the goal type and goal orientations (how the goal will be pursued) is related to well-being. ET provides a clear hierarchy for Agentic and Communal Dimensions, favoring Shared Goal Orientation and Constitutive Goal Pursuit, as they are more theoretically aligned with eudaimonia and more empirically related to EWB. Although the eudaimonic goal congruency literature is in its infancy, preliminary findings are consistent with ET.

As previously mentioned, Communal Goal Congruence refers to the appropriate discrimination of social goal types (Individual, Interpersonal) and degree of Shared Goal Orientation (low, high). Congruence occurs when an individual pursues Individual Goals independently (low Shared Goal Orientation) and Interpersonal Goals interdependently (high Shared Goal Orientation). Owenz et al. (2010) reported that appropriate fit between Shared Goal Orientation and Interpersonal Goals (Interpersonal Goal, high Shared Goal Orientation) related to higher reported well-being. Communal goal congruence is an important aspect in ET.

ET Agency research indicates that Constitutive Goal Orientation is positively associated with EWB, while Instrumental Goal Orientation relates to HWB (Fowers et al., 2010; Winakur et al., 2010). These findings support ET’s two-dimensional model of goal pursuit.
The new hypotheses expand upon ET by suggesting that the combination of Communal Goal Orientation, Communal Goal Type, and Agentic Goal Orientation will relate to increased well-being. Eudaimonia is constituted by regular successes over a broad range of life goals. In order to lead a eudaimonic life, an individual would need to prioritize a Constitutive and high Shared Goals Orientation toward Interpersonal Goals. However, everyone will also have Individual and Instrumental Goals, which are necessary for some aspects of life. Similarly, in order to experience hedonic well-being a person would need to prioritize Instrumental Goal Pursuit and low Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals. The present study is the first to theorize and empirically test the relationship between Eudaimonic Goal Hierarchy and well-being.

**The Present Study.** The present study will replicate the significant relationship between Communion Dimension Goal Congruency and well-being (Owenz et al., 2010). Research and theory support the hypotheses that appropriate fit between Communal Goal type (Individual and Interpersonal) and Shared Goals Orientation are related to well-being. I anticipate that goal congruency between high Shared Goals Orientation and Interpersonal Goal type will be positively related to EWB and HWB. Conversely, I expect to replicate findings that incongruently high Shared Goals Orientation and Individual Goal type are negatively related to EWB and HWB. Similarly, I expect that for Individual Goals, Shared Goals Orientation will be negatively related to EWB and HWB.

This study will also replicate Fowers et al.’s (2010) findings that Agentic Goal Pursuit approaches (Instrumental and Constitutive) significantly relate to well-being. I
expect to replicate findings that there is a significant relationship between an Instrumental Goal Pursuit approach and HWB. Similarly, I anticipate replicating the findings that there is a significant relationship between a Constitutive Goal Pursuit approach and EWB. Another original contribution of this study is that the Agentic Dimension of Goal Pursuit will be examined separately for Individual and Interpersonal goals.

As research and theory indicate that the Shared Goals Orientation and Constitutive Goal Pursuit approach are related to EWB, this raises the following question: Will Shared Goal Orientation moderate the relationship between Constitutive Goal Pursuit and EWB? I expect when a goal is identified as Interpersonal, Shared Goals Orientation will augment the effect of Constitutive Goal Pursuit on EWB. Similarly, since low Shared Goals Orientation and Instrumental Goal Pursuit approach are both theoretically more aligned with and empirically related to HWB, this leads to the following question: Will Shared Goal Orientation moderate the relationship between Instrumental Goal Approach and HWB? I expect when a goal is identified as an Individual Goal, Shared Goal Orientation will augment the effect of Instrumental Approach on HWB. This study will be the first to explore the Agency Dimension and the Communion Dimension in combination. Shared Goal Orientation will be investigated as a moderator of the relationship between the Agency Dimension (Instrumental vs. Constitutive) and well-being.
Hypotheses

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate Hypotheses 1A-1C.

Hypothesis 1A: EWB will regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals.

Hypothesis 1B: EWB will regress on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals.

Hypothesis 1C: Shared Goal Orientation toward Interpersonal Goals will augment the relationship between Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit and EWB.

Figures 3 and 4 illustrate Hypotheses 2A and 2B.

Hypothesis 2A: EWB will regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals.

Hypothesis 2B: EWB will not regress on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals.

Figures 5 and 6 illustrate Hypotheses 3A and 3B.

Hypothesis 3A: HWB will regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals.

Hypothesis 3B: HWB will not regress on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals.

Figures 7 and 8 illustrate Hypotheses 4A-4C.

Hypothesis 4A: HWB will regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals.

Hypothesis 4B: HWB will regress on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals.

Hypothesis 4C: Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals will augment the relationship between Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit and HWB.
In addition to these hypotheses, I will examine whether the predicted relationships differ across gender and culture.
Chapter 3: Methods

Participants

The sample consisted of 709 undergraduate students from two southeastern universities: one private and one public. The average age was 19.79 years, (SD = 3.61). There were 493 female (69.5%) and 213 male (30%) participants, while 3 participants (0.4%) declined to report gender. The ethnic make-up of the sample varied: 51.9% identified as Hispanic, 28.1% as White, 5.6% as Asian, 4.4% as Biracial, 4.1% as Black Caribbean, 3.1% as Black non-Caribbean, and 2.7% as Other ethnicity.

Measures

Hedonic Well-Being outcome measures

The Affect Balance Scale (ABS; Bradburn, 1969) assesses positive and negative affect and has been used in research focusing on well-being variables, such as Psychological Well-Being (Ryff, 1989) and life satisfaction (e.g., Liang, 1985). The ABS has been used with a variety of age groups (e.g., Stacey & Gatz, 1991) and with both psychiatric and nonpsychiatric populations (e.g., Moriwaki, 1974). The 10-item scale is equally divided into two subscales: Positive Affect and Negative Affect. Respondents specify whether they have experienced a particular affect over the past few weeks with a “yes” or “no” response. An example of a positive affect question is “Did you feel particularly excited or interested in something?” An example of a negative affect question is “Did you feel depressed or very unhappy?” Scores for each subscale are obtained by summing the ratings into an Affect Balance score. Several researchers have substantiated support for the two-factor theory of
Affect Balance (e.g., Baker, Cesa, Gatz, & Mellins, 1992; Helmes, Goffin, & Chrisjohn, 2010; Kim & Mueller, 2001). In addition, the ABS has satisfactory convergent validity and good test-retest reliability (e.g., Bradburn, 1969; Lewis, McCollam, & Joseph, 2000). The internal consistency of the ABS is less adequate, as Lewis et al. (2000) reported Cronbach alpha coefficients of .50 for the negative affect scale and .67 for the positive affect scale.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985) is a measure of global life satisfaction. The measure includes five items with a seven-point Likert response scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Sample items include “The conditions of my life are excellent” and “In most ways my life is close to my ideal.” The authors of a factor analysis reported results indicating that a single factor solution explained 66% of the variance (Diener et al., 1985). In addition, scores on SWLS indicated moderate to high correlations with other measures of HWB, including Fordyce’s (1978) Global Scale of Happiness and Andrews and Withey’s (1976) Life Satisfaction Scale (e.g., Diener et al., 1985).

**Eudaimonic Well-Being outcome measures**

Ryff (1989) developed the Scales of Psychological Well-Being, a comprehensive, theory-based measure that Ryff and Singer (2006) described as a Eudaimonic approach to well-being. It includes six scales: Self-Acceptance, Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Purpose in Life, Positive Relations With Others, and Personal Growth. Three scales were used as indicators of Eudaimonic Well-Being: Personal Growth, Purpose in Life, and Positive Relations With Others. Each scale consists of 14 items with a six-point Likert response scale ranging from
"completely disagree" to "completely agree." Personal Growth, Purpose in Life, and Positive Relations With Others have alpha coefficients of 0.85, 0.88, and 0.88, respectively (Ryff, 1989). The construct validity of these scales is supported by theoretically predicted relationships with Affect Balance, life satisfaction, self-actualization, and positive indicators of mental health (Keyes et al., 2002; Ryff, 1989).

**Goal Pursuit measures**

In the Goals Worksheet (Fowers et al., 2010), participants were asked to list their three most important individual goals and three most important goals that they were pursuing with others. Participants were asked to provide the key action they were using to pursue each of their six important goals. This measure was validated on a sample of college students of mainly White, non-Latino and Latino descent.

**Instrumental Approach to Goal Pursuit measures**

The Instrumental Goal Orientation scale (Fowers et al., 2010) used the idiographic goals and key actions that participants provided in their Goals Worksheet. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which seven statements accurately described why they chose the particular key action to pursue their goal. All seven of the statements conveyed an Instrumental Orientation (focused on utility and efficacy). For example, one Instrumental Orientation item is “Because this key action is the most efficient way to reach this goal.” The items are scored on a six-point Likert response scale ranging from “not true at all” to “very true.” The participants rated each goal and key action pair. Because there were six goals, there were six ratings per item. The items are summed across goals, which means that I am
assessing the Instrumental Goal orientation at the level of the person, not the goal. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .85, indicating good internal consistency. As theorized, Instrumental Orientation significantly correlated with Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit (Fowers et al., 2010). This measure was validated on a sample of college students of mainly White, non-Latino and Latino descent.

Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit (Fowers et al., 2010) includes items focused on Fun and Challenge from two subscales of the Personal Projects Matrix (Palys & Little, 1983). Participants were asked to rate each of their six important goals on a 10-point Likert type scale ranging from "not at all" to "extremely." The Fun subscale consists of six items focused on the degree to which a goal is fun. A sample Fun subscale item is "Some goals are intrinsically fun, whimsical or delightful. How much fun is this goal for you?" The Challenge measure consists of three items from the Efficacy subscale of the Personal Projects Matrix, as described in Fowers et al. (2010).

The relationship between Instrumental Goal Orientation and HWB is predicted to be mediated by Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit. For the purposes of this study, the combination of Instrumental Goal Orientation and Instrumental Modes of Goal Pursuit are referred to as the Instrumental Approach to Goal Pursuit.

**Constitutive Approach to Goal Pursuit Measures**

Similarly, the Constitutive Goal Orientation Scale (Fowers et al., 2010) uses the idiographic goals and key actions that participants provided on their Goals Worksheet. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which seven statements accurately described why they chose a particular key action to pursue their goal. All
seven of the statements convey a Constitutive Orientation to Goal Pursuit (focused on the inseparability of the means from the ends of the goal). One example of a Constitutive Orientation item is “Because doing this key action is what it means to attain this goal.” The items were scored on a six-point Likert response scale ranging from “not true at all” to “very true.” The participants rated each goal and key action pair. Because there were six goals, there were six ratings per item. The items were summed across goals, which means that I assessed the Constitutive Goal Orientation at the level of the person, not the goal. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .86 indicating good internal consistency. As theorized, Constitutive Orientation significantly correlated with Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit (Fowers et al., 2010). This measure was validated on a sample of college students of mainly White, non-Latino and Latino descent.

Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit (Fowers et al., 2010) consists of items from two measures: the Integrity subscale of the Personal Projects Matrix (Palys & Little, 1983) and the Personal Expressiveness subscale of the Personally Expressive Activities Questionnaire Standard Form (PEAQ-S; Waterman, 1993).

Integrity is a four-item subscale that measures the degree to which a goal is integral to a person’s life for each of their important goals. Participants were asked to rate the Integrity of each of their six key actions using a 10-point Likert type scale ranging from “not at all” to “extremely.” For example, one question asks, "To what extent is this goal consistent with the values that guide your life?" The alpha for this scale has been reported at 0.74 in previous ET research (Fowers et al., 2010).
Personal Expressiveness is a six-item subscale that measures the degree to which an individual identifies with his or her activities. Participants were asked to rate each of their six key actions using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." One example of an item prompt is the following: "This activity gives me the strongest feeling of who I really am.” A 1-week test-retest reliability of 0.82 and an alpha coefficient of 0.90 have been reported (Waterman, 1993).

The relationship between Constitutive Goal Orientation and EWB is predicted to be mediated by Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit. For the purposes of this study, combination of Constitutive Goal Orientation and Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit are referred to as the Constitutive Approach to Goal Pursuit.

**Shared Goal Orientation measure**

As described in Owenz et al. (2010), the Shared Goal Orientation Scale is a six-item measure of how strongly an individual perceives each of their six important goals to be jointly pursued with others and not pursued alone. Examples of items include the following: “To what extent do you consider your goal a partnership with someone else?” and “To what extent is collaboration with others unavoidable in pursuing this goal?” Participants were asked to rate their agreement for each item on a six-point Likert scale from "Not at all” to “Very much so.” The participants rated each goal and key action dyad. Because there were six goals, there were seven ratings per item. High scores indicate a shared orientation to the goal, while low scores indicate low Shared Goal Orientation (in other words, high individual orientation toward the goal). This measure was validated on a sample of college students of mainly White, non-Latino and Latino descent.
**Procedures**

The participants were recruited on a volunteer basis from psychology and education undergraduate courses. Subjects who participated in this research were given a detailed informed consent form that described the current research, its purpose, as well as its possible future use. Participants were instructed that taking part in the study was completely voluntary and were informed of the right to withdraw from the study at any time. In addition, the participants were guaranteed anonymity. Therefore, none of the data or information gathered can be traced to any of the participants. The order of the administration of the measures was consistent for all participants. The questionnaires were administered online through a secure web portal. Participants were asked to answer a series of goals inventories using the computer administered questionnaire that was created using FileMaker Pro. The participants were only required to enter their six goals and key actions once. To create ease in answering questions, the FileMaker Pro program was set to automatically populate the screen with the relevant goal or activity the participant initially entered. All data entered by the participants were set to automatically transfer from FileMaker Pro to an SPSS file to reduce the likelihood of input errors.
Chapter 4: Results

Data Analysis

Statistical calculations and models were analyzed using the program Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2017). Full information maximum likelihood estimation (FIML) was utilized to control missing data, which allowed for all participants to be retained in the study. FIML uses all available information in all observations (without imputing missing values (see Enders, 2010; Schafer & Graham, 2002), instead of deleting observations with missing values. Robust standard errors were used to account for non-normality of data and any possible heteroscedasticity. Standardized path coefficients are reported for all analyses.

Model analyses. Kline’s (2005) two-step approach to structural equation modeling was utilized to guide the model specification. First, I specified a measurement model and tested the fit for each model. If the measurement model fit well, I fitted a structural model to test the hypotheses. The present study utilized model fit indices provided by the Mplus software including: $x^2$, the comparative fit index (CFI), the standardized root mean-square residual (SRMR), and the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA). As recommended by Kline (2011) and Hu and Bentler (1999), SRMR less than or equal to .08, RMSEA values less than .08, models with CFI values equal to or greater than .95 indicate an adequate fit to the data. In the moderation models, no absolute fit statistics are provided in Mplus when using the XWITH command, which is necessary for the moderation model. Thus, it is recommended to use the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) as a relative fit statistic,
which can be compared to models in which the moderation variables have been removed or constrained. Lower Akaike criterion scores indicate better model fit

**Study variables.** The construct of EWB served as a dependent variable and was conceptualized as an endogenous, continuous latent factor measured by three indicators: the Personal Growth, Purpose in Life, and Positive Relations with Others scales of the Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff, 1989).

HWB served as a dependent variable and was conceptualized as an endogenous, continuous latent factor measured by the following three indicators: the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985), the Positive Affect Scale of the Affect Balance Scale and the Negative Affect Scale of the Affect Balance Scale (Bradburn, 1969).

Following the measurement approach described by Fowers et al. (2010), I conceptualized the Agency Dimension of ET as two independent pathways: the Instrumental Goal Pursuit Approach and the Constitutive Goal Pursuit Approach. Instrumental Goal Pursuit was measured by the Instrumental Goal Orientation Scale (an observed variable) and the Instrumental Modes of Goal Pursuit latent variable, which was hypothesized to consist of the Fun and Challenge items of the Personal Projects Matrix (Palys & Little, 1983).

Constitutive Goal Pursuit was measured by the Constitutive Goal Orientation Scale (an observed variable) and the Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit Scales, a latent variable that consists of the Integrity subscale from the Personal Projects Matrix (Palys & Little, 1983) and the Personal Expressiveness subscale of the PEAQ-S (Waterman, 1993).
Finally, the moderator was conceptualized as an exogenous, observed variable measured by the Shared Goal Orientation Scale (Owenz et. al., 2010). Shared Goal Orientation was conceptualized as representing the Communion Dimension of ET and was employed in all models. The data were modeled separately for individual goals and interpersonal goals.

Shared Goal Orientation was investigated as a moderator of both forms of Goal Pursuit and both well-being latent variables. Each hypothesized path will be tested separately. Statistically significant path coefficients indicate support for the hypotheses.

Gender was investigated as a dichotomous grouping variable. Both male and female models were tested for model and path differences. Specific hypotheses based on gender were not proposed, as these are exploratory analyses.

Ethnicity was investigated as a dichotomous grouping variable, as only the Latino and non-Latino White sample sizes were adequate for comparative analyses. Specific hypotheses based on ethnicity were not proposed, as these are exploratory analyses.

**Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1A: EWB will regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals.

Hypothesis 1B: EWB will regress on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals.

Hypothesis 1C: Shared Goal Orientation toward Interpersonal Goals will augment the relationship between Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit and EWB.
**Measurement model.** First, I fitted a measurement model for Hypothesis 1, which included the two latent variables EWB and Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals. The fit statistics indicated an excellent fit ($\chi^2 = 8.783$, (df = 5), $p = .118$, CFI = .995, SRMR = .032, RMSEA = .034). The fit statistics suggest that it is appropriate to assess the full structural model.

**Proposed model.** Next, I evaluated the relative fit of the proposed Hypothesis 1 moderation model. The anticipated indicators (Personal Growth, Purpose in Life, Positive Relationships with Others) loaded strongly on EWB and replicated earlier findings. The anticipated indicators of the latent variable Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals (Interpersonal Integrity and Interpersonal Expressiveness) loaded on the latent variable and replicated earlier findings.

Results did not support hypothesis 1A, as EWB did not correlate with Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals ($\beta = -.034$, SE = .056, n.s.). In support of Hypothesis 1B, EWB was correlated with Constitutive Mode of Interpersonal Goal Pursuit ($\beta = .607$, SE = .155, $p < .001$). Shared Goal Orientation did not augment the relationship between Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals and EWB, as predicted ($\beta = .021$, SE = .047, n.s.).

**Moderation constrained model.** Because Mplus does not provide model fit statistics when the XWITH moderation command is used, I wanted to assess whether removing the moderation would change model fit. The first step was to create a modified model for Hypothesis 1 in which the moderation path was constrained to zero. As there are no fit statistics provided in moderation models, it was necessary to compare the proposed Hypothesis 1 moderation model with the moderation
constrained model using the relative fit index of AIC. The relative fit of the two models was quite similar as the AIC was 12,535.007 for the original model and 12,533.208 for the constrained moderation model.

**No-moderation model.** Given that the moderation hypothesis was not supported by either model, a model was fitted that omitted the moderation altogether, prior to testing for gender and cultural differences (See Figure 9.). The fit statistics indicated a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 39.127$ (df=10), $p = .000$, CFI = .968, SRMR = .043, RMSEA = .066) and all but one of the paths was significant ($p < .05$). I placed less emphasis on the $\chi^2$ fit statistic because it is very sensitive to sample size and model complexity, both of which were major factors in this study.

The AIC for the no moderation model was 12,533.203, which is very similar to the two prior moderation models. In addition, when the parameter estimates are compared across the models, they are quite similar. Given this combination of evidence, the more parsimonious (no moderation) model is a better choice.

The no-moderation model results indicated that EWB regressed on to Constitutive Mode of Interpersonal Goal Pursuit ($\beta = .553, SE = .088, p < .001$), in support of Hypothesis 1B. Contrary to Hypothesis 1A, EWB did not regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals ($\beta = -.045, SE = .075, \text{n.s.}$). Interpersonal Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit regressed on Interpersonal Constitutive Goal Orientation ($\beta = .287, SE = .050, p < .001$). Shared Goal Orientation toward Interpersonal Goals correlated with Interpersonal Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit ($\beta = .375, SE = .072, p < .001$).
**No-moderation ethnicity comparison.** The ethnicity comparison for Hypothesis 1 utilized the single group, no-moderation model, and included ethnicity as a grouping variable for Latino \( (n = 361) \) and White non-Latino participants \( (n = 193) \). The other ethnic groups were excluded from these analyses due to inadequate sample sizes \( (n \leq 40) \). The AIC for the ethnicity model \( (AIC = 9,151.99) \) was markedly smaller than the single group model \( (AIC = 12,533.203) \), indicating that an ethnicity breakdown is a better fit for the data.

The absolute fit statistics (see Table 5) indicated that the two-group ethnicity model \( (x^2 = 67.911, (df = 29), p = .000, CFI = .952, SRMR = .058, RMSEA = .070) \) and the single group model \( (x^2 = 39.127, (df = 10), p = .000, CFI = .968, SRMR = .043, RMSEA = .066) \) both adequately fit the data and were not dramatically different. The absolute fit indices did not indicate that the ethnicity model better fit the data.

EWB did not regress onto Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals for Latino participants \( (\beta = -.027, SE = .057, n.s.) \) or White, non-Latino participants \( (\beta = -.029, SE = .060, n.s.) \). This finding was consistent with the results of the single group model \( (\beta = -.045, SE = .075, n.s.) \). EWB regressed onto Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals for Latino participants \( (\beta = .482, SE = .074, p < .001) \) and White, non-Latino participants \( (\beta = .421, SE = .113, p < .001) \), which was also consistent with the single group model. See Table 6 for complete parameter comparisons. No major differences were found between the path coefficients in the models separated by ethnicity.
**No-moderation gender comparison.** The gender comparison for Hypothesis 1 modified the single group model by including the grouping variable of gender. There were 468 females and 199 males. Four participants did not respond to the gender question and were excluded from these analyses. The AIC for the gender comparison was 12,299.961, and was only slightly lower than the single group model (AIC = 12,533.203). Absolute fit statistics indicated a good fit to the data ($x^2 = 68.436, (df = 29), p = .000, CFI = .956, SRMR = .055, RMSEA = .064$) for the gender comparison and the single group model ($x^2 = 39.127, (df = 10) p = .000, CFI = .968, SRMR = .043, RMSEA = .066$) (see Table 7.). Gender x ethnicity analyses were not performed due to the relatively small sample size for males.

EWB regressed onto Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals for both women ($\beta = .624, SE = .093, p < .001$) and men ($\beta = .465, SE = .100, p < .001$), indicating a mild gender difference. EWB did not regress onto Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals for either women ($\beta = -.067, SE = .077, n.s.$) or men ($\beta = -.063, SE = .074, n.s.$), consistent with the single group model. The results suggest that for this hypothesis, a single group model fits the data as well as a gender-separated model. See Table 8 for complete parameter comparisons. Parsimony favors the single group model.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2A: EWB will regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals.

Hypothesis 2B: EWB will not regress on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals.
**Measurement model.** First, I fitted a measurement model for Hypothesis 2, which included the two latent variables EWB and Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals. In the initial attempt, a Heywood case occurred. This was due to the failure of the Challenge observed variable to load on the Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit factor. Another subscale of the Personal Projects Matrix, the Efficacy Scale, is theoretically consistent with Instrumental Goal Pursuit and it was substituted for the Challenge scale. With this substitution, the fit to the data was excellent ($x^2 = 9.824$, (df = 5), $p = .080$, CFI = .994, SRMR = .015, RMSEA = .038). The fit statistics suggest that it is appropriate to fit the full structural mode. The Efficacy scale was used in all subsequent analyses when the Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit was employed.

**Proposed model.** Next, I evaluated the fit of the proposed Hypothesis 2 model (See Figure 10.). The fit statistics indicated a good fit to the data ($x^2 = 31.640$, (df = 9), $p = .002$, CFI = .976, SRMR = .038, RMSEA = .061) and all but one path coefficient was significant ($p < .05$). The indicators (Personal Growth, Purpose in Life, Positive Relationships with Others) loaded strongly on the latent variable EWB and replicated earlier findings. The anticipated indicators of the latent variable Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals (Interpersonal Efficacy and Interpersonal Fun) loaded as predicted on the latent variable and replicated earlier findings.

Contrary to prediction, EWB did not regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals ($\beta = -.078$, SE = .056, n.s.). EWB regressed on Instrumental
Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals ($\beta = .384$, SE = .057, $p < .001$), contrary to prediction.

**Ethnicity comparison.** The ethnicity comparison model for Hypothesis 2 included ethnicity as a grouping variable for Latino ($n = 361$) and White non-Latino participants ($n = 193$) (see Table 9.). The AIC for the ethnicity model was $10,210.215$, and was markedly smaller than the single group model (AIC = $12,398.646$), indicating that the model that separates ethnicity is a better fit than the single group model. The absolute fit statistics indicated that the ethnic group model ($\chi^2 = 53.186$, (df = 24), $p = .000$, CFI = .963, SRMR = .050, RMSEA = .066) did not differ substantially from the single group model ($\chi^2 = 31.640$, (df = 9), $p = .002$ CFI = .976, SRMR = .038, RMSEA = .061).

Consistent with the single group findings, EWB regressed on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals for Latino participants ($\beta = .449$, SE = .074, $p < .001$) and White, non-Latino participants ($\beta = .435$, SE = .102, $p < .05$) (see Table 10.). EWB did not regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals for Latino participants ($\beta = -.019$, SE = .057, n.s.), consistent with the results of the single group model ($\beta = -.078$, SE = .056, n.s.). However, EWB did regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goal Pursuit Goals for White, non-Latino participants ($\beta = .216$, SE = .100, $p < .05$). This constitutes a major difference between the two ethnic groups. In combination with the difference in the AICs of the two models, this difference in the path from Shared Goal Orientation to EWB suggests that the results differed for the White, non-Latino and Latino participants.
Gender comparison. The gender comparison for Hypothesis 2 modified the Goal Pursuit single group model by including the grouping variable of gender (see Table 11). There were 468 females and 199 males. The AIC for the gender-separated model was 12,329.033 and was only slightly smaller than the single group model (AIC = 12,398.646), suggesting that dividing the model into genders does not improve the model greatly. Absolute fit statistics indicated a good fit to the data for both the gender-separated model ($\chi^2 = 39.121$, $df = 24$, $p = .000$, $CFI = .984$, $SRMR = .041$, $RMSEA = .043$) and the single group model ($\chi^2 = 31.640$, $df = 9$, $p = .002$ $CFI = .976$, $SRMR = .038$, $RMSEA = .061$).

As with the single group model, EWB regressed on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals for women ($\beta = .405$, SE = .066, $p < .001$) and for men ($\beta = .400$, SE = .090, $p < .001$) (see table 12.). Consistent with the single group model, EWB did not regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals for either women ($\beta = .099$, SE = .054, n.s.) or men ($\beta = .011$, SE = .067, n.s.). In general, the results suggest that for this hypothesis, the gender-separated model was not substantially different from a single-group model, and parsimony favors the single-group model.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3A: HWB will regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals.

Hypothesis 3B: HWB will not regress on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals.

Measurement model. First, I fitted a measurement model for Hypothesis 3, which included the two latent variables HWB and Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit
for Individual Goals. The fit statistics indicated an excellent fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 5.446$, (df = 4), $p = .244$, CFI = .993, SRMR = .017, RMSEA = .023). The fit statistics suggest that it is appropriate to fit the full structural mode.

**Proposed model.** The fit statistics for the proposed Hypothesis 3 model indicated a good fit to the data, ($\chi^2 = 16.715$, (df = 9), $p = .053$, CFI = .969, SRMR = .026, RMSEA = .036) and all paths were significant (see Figure 11.). The anticipated indicators of the latent variable HWB (Satisfaction with Life, Affect Balance Scale Positive, and Affect Balance Scale Negative) loaded strongly and replicated earlier findings. The anticipated indicators of the latent variable Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals (Individual Integrity and Individual Personal Expression) loaded strongly and replicated earlier results.

Contrary to hypothesis 3B, HWB regressed on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals ($\beta = .691$, SE = .165, $p < .001$). HWB regressed on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals ($\beta = -.220$, SE = .092, $p < .05$) with the predicted negative association.

**Ethnicity comparison.** The ethnicity model for Hypothesis 3, included ethnicity as a grouping variable for Latino ($n = 361$) and White non-Latino participants ($n = 193$). The AIC for the ethnicity model (10,953.00) was markedly smaller than the single group model (14,204.122). The absolute fit statistics indicated that the two-ethnicity group model was a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 33.837$, (df = 24), $p = .087$, CFI = .971, SRMR = .038, RMSEA = .038) and did not dramatically differ from the single group model ($\chi^2 = 16.715$, (df = 9), $p = .053$, CFI = .969, SRMR = .026, RMSEA = .036). See Table 13 for a summary of the fit statistic comparisons.
Consistent with the single group findings, HWB regressed on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual goals for Latino participants (β = 0.592, SE = 0.140, p < .001) and White, non-Latino participants (β = 0.468, SE = 0.168, p < .01) (see 14.). EWB regressed on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals for Latino participants (β = -0.183, SE = 0.059, p < .05), consistent with the results of the single group model (β = -0.220, SE = 0.092, p < .05). However, HWB did not regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals for White, non-Latino participants (β = -0.118, SE = 0.137, n.s.). This constitutes a substantial difference between the two ethnic groups.

**Gender comparison.** The gender comparison for Hypothesis 3 modified the single group model by including the grouping variable of gender (see Table 15 for fit statistics). There were 468 females and 199 males. The AIC for the ethnicity model (AIC 13,882.463) was smaller than the single group model (AIC 14,204.122). However, the Mplus software warned that the latent variable covariance matrix (PSI) in the male group was not positive definite. Reasonable modifications of the model were attempted, but this impediment could not be removed, thus the male data could not be analyzed. The absolute fit statistics indicated that the two-gender comparison was a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 33.254$, (df = 24), $p = .000$, CFI = .973, SRMR = .036, RMSEA = .029), but did not dramatically differ from the single group model ($\chi^2 = 16.715$, (df = 9), $p = .053$, CFI = .969, SRMR = .026, RMSEA = .036).

HWB regressed on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals for female participants (β = .587, SE = .132, p < .001), consistent with the single group findings (β = .691, SE = .165, p < .001) (see Table 16.). Results indicated that HWB
regressed on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals for females ($\beta = -.117$, SE = .073, $p < .05$), consistent with the single group sample ($\beta = -.220$, SE = .092, $p < .05$). All anticipated correlations in the female-only group were consistent with the single-group proposed model, but no between-group comparisons could be made due to non-positive definite latent variable variance matrices for the male data. Therefore, the single-group model appears to represent the data most parsimoniously.

**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis 4A: HWB will regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals.

Hypothesis 4B: HWB will regress on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals.

Hypothesis 4C: Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals will augment the relationship between Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit and HWB.

**Measurement model.** First, I fitted a measurement model for Hypothesis 4, which included the two latent variables HWB and Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals. The fit statistics suggest that it is appropriate to test the full structural model ($\chi^2 = 11.542$, (df = 5), $p = .041$, CFI = .972, SRMR = .024, RMSEA = .044).

**Proposed model.** Second, I evaluated the fit of the proposed Hypothesis 4 moderation model. All except one path coefficient was significant. The anticipated indicators of the latent variable HWB (Satisfaction with Life, Affect Balance Scale Positive, and Affect Balance Scale Negative) were good and replicated earlier findings. The anticipated indicators of the latent variable Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals (Individual Efficacy and Individual Fun) were good and
replicated earlier findings. Results indicated that HWB regressed on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals, with the expected negative association ($\beta = -.085$, SE = .090, $p < .05$). HWB also regressed on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals ($\beta = .784$, SE = .163, $p < .01$). Individual Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit regressed on Instrumental Goal Orientation ($\beta = .090$, SE = .031, $p < .01$). HWB did not regress on the moderation variable ($\beta = .057$, SE = .109, n.s.), indicating that Shared Goal Orientation did not augment the relationship between Instrumental Goal Orientation and HWB.

**Moderation constrained model.** A modified moderation constrained model for Hypothesis 4 was created in which the moderation path was constrained to zero. As standard fit statistics are not provided in moderation models, it was necessary to compare the proposed Hypothesis 4 moderation model with the moderation constrained model with the relative fits statistic AIC. The relative fit of the constrained moderation model (AIC = 11,176.791) was quite similar to the hypothesized moderation model (AIC = 11,178.536). Results indicated that HWB regressed on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals ($\beta = -.085$, SE = .040, $p < .05$). HWB also regressed on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals ($\beta = .777$, SE = .164, $p < .01$). Individual Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit regressed on Instrumental Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals ($\beta = .090$, SE = .031, $p < .01$).

**No-moderation model.** Given that the moderation hypothesis was not supported by either model, a single group no-moderation model was created, which omitted the moderation altogether, prior to testing for gender and cultural differences (see Figure
The fit statistics indicated a good fit to the data \( (x^2 = 16.715, \text{df} = 12), p = .000 \) CFI = .969 SRMR = .026, RMSEA = .036). All path coefficients were significant \( (p < .05) \). The AIC for the no moderation model \( \text{AIC 11,176.774} \) does not differ from the proposed moderation model \( \text{AIC 11,178.536} \). Given this combination of evidence, the more parsimonious no moderation model is a better choice.

The no-moderation model results indicated that Hypothesis 4A was supported, as HWB regressed on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals \( (\beta = -.117, \text{SE} = .056, p < .05) \), with the expected negative relationship (see Table 18 for parameter estimates). HWB regressed on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals \( (\beta = .458, \text{SE} = .076, p < .001) \), consistent with Hypothesis 4B. Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals was also correlated with Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit \( (\beta = .228, \text{SE} = .057, p < .001) \).

**No-moderation ethnicity comparison.** The ethnicity comparison model for Hypothesis 4 utilized the model without the moderator, and included ethnicity as a grouping variable for Latino \( (n = 361) \) and White non-Latino participants \( (n = 193) \). The AIC for the ethnicity model was 10,751.115, which was markedly smaller than the single group model \( \text{AIC 13,052.372} \). The relative fit statistics suggest improvements in the model by separating the ethnic groups (see Table 18.).

The absolute fit statistics indicated an equally good fit to the data for the two-group comparison \( (x^2 = 47.912, \text{df} = 31), p = .026, \text{CFI} = .936, \text{SRMR} = .045, \text{RMSEA} = .044) \), as the single group model \( (x^2 = 16.715, \text{df} = 12), p = .000 \text{CFI} = .969 \text{SRMR} = .026, \text{RMSEA} = .036) \) (see Table 15.).
HWB did not regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals for Latino participants ($\beta = -.101$, SE = .063, n.s.) or White, non-Latino participants ($\beta = -.085$, SE = .054, n.s.). This finding was unexpected, given that, this relationship was found in the single group model ($\beta = -.117$, SE = .056, $p < .05$). HWB regressed on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals for Latino participants ($\beta = -.438$, SE = .089, $p < .001$) and White, non-Latino participants ($\beta = .394$, SE = .081, $p < .001$). No major differences were found between the results by ethnicity. However, when divided by ethnicity neither Latino nor White, non-Latino groups’ results supported the hypothesis that HWB regressed on to Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals.

**No-moderation gender comparison.** The gender comparison for Hypothesis 4 modified the single group model by including the grouping variable of gender. There were 468 females and 199 males (see Table 19 for fit statistics.). The AIC for the gender comparison (AIC 12,979.194) was larger than the single group model (AIC 11,176.774) indicating a better fit for the single-group model. Absolute fit statistics also indicated a less than adequate fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 60.377$, (df = 31), $p = .001$, CFI = .904, SRMR = .046, RMSEA = .053) for the gender comparison, particularly compared to the single group model ($\chi^2 = 16.715$, (df = 12), $p = .000$ CFI = .969 SRMR = .026, RMSEA = .036). Given that the results of the model comparisons clearly favored the single-group model, no further comparisons of the models were made.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Rationale for study

The purpose of this study was to empirically examine a bi-dimensional ET model derived from the Nicomachean Ethics (Aristotle, 1999). The present study examined the relationships between Modes of Goal Pursuit and Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being in an ethnically diverse undergraduate university student sample of men and women. Despite a proliferation of studies in the areas of well-being and goals, much of the research is focused on Individual Goals, Instrumental Goals and HWB. ET and the present study have provided a broader vision of goals and well-being, including Shared Goals, Constitutive Goals and EWB in the models (e.g., Fowers, 2012).

The current study attempted to replicate previous ET research investigated how Well-Being (EWB vs. HWB) related to either the Dimensions of Agency (Instrumental vs. Constitutive) or Communion (Shared Goal Orientation toward Interpersonal or Individual Goal type). The present study extended previous research by expanding the model structure to include both Communal and Agentic Dimensions. This study went beyond replication by testing for moderation between theoretically predicted relationships among Agency and Communion Dimensions and EWB and HWB, and by examining individual and interpersonal goals separately. Although no moderation was found, these findings proved fruitful. Results indicated that the relationships of Communion and Agency with Well-Being are cumulative and not multiplicative.
Study variables

Well-Being variables. This study corroborated previous findings on indicators of EWB and HWB (e.g., Fowers et al., 2010; Fowers, et al., 2016). This study consistently indicated that EWB is a latent variable indicated by measures of Purpose in Life, Positive Relationships with Others and Personal Growth. Psychological Well-Being, which includes the three indicators of the latent EWB, is related to several important outcomes for adults, such as including higher life satisfaction, better physical health and increased social support (Bowman & Kitayama, 2009; Ryff, 2008). Similarly, throughout this study, HWB was a latent variable indicated by measures of Satisfaction with Life, Positive Affect and Negative Affect.

Agency variables. The present study replicated previous ET research in which Agentic Dimension constructs of Constitutive and Instrumental Modes of Goal Pursuit were modeled as latent variables (Fowers et. al., 2010). Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit was indicated by Personal Expression and Integrity. Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit was a latent variable indicated by Fun and Efficacy. Initially, Challenge a subscale of the Personal Projects Matrix Efficacy scale (Palys & Little, 1983), was hypothesized to be a part of the model as indicated by a recent ET factor analytic study (Fowers et al., 2010); however, it resulted in poor model fit. For that reason, the full Efficacy scale (which includes the Challenge items) was used to replace it. Perhaps present participants responded somewhat differently from the Agency study participants. Unexplored differences between these samples may be to the source of this difference. Future studies may shed light on the best indicators of the Instrumental Mode latent variable. ET views Instrumental Goal Pursuit as
primarily related to HWB, and Constitutive Goal Pursuit as primarily aligned with EWB (e.g., Fowers, 2012). The present study tested for these relationships, which were detailed in the hypotheses section.

**Communion Dimension.** The present study attempted to corroborate Owenz et al.’s (2010) findings that, Shared Goal Congruence was related to Well-Being. Owenz et al. (2010) found that Shared Goal Orientation toward Interpersonal Goals was positively related to EWB and HWB. In contrast, Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual goals was negatively related to HWB and EWB. In partial support of the hypotheses, this study found that Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals was negatively related to HWB. However, the hypotheses suggesting that Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals would be positively related to EWB was only supported among White, non-Latino participants, when Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals is the other predictor. The partial replication and extension of the Communion hypotheses are explored in more detail below.

**Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1.** As hypothesized, EWB regressed on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals, a replication of previous findings. The relationship between Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit and EWB corroborates Fowers et al.’s (2010) results, and adds unique information that this relationship holds with Interpersonal Goals. In contrast, the hypothesis that EWB would regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals was not supported. This result is inconsistent with previous ET Communion research (Owenz et al., 2010) and theory because it suggests that for Interpersonal Goals, an individual’s level of Shared Goal Orientation
does not relate to EWB, at least when the Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit is taken into account. The goal hierarchy hypotheses anticipated that to experience higher EWB, an individual would need to prioritize the Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit and high Shared Goals Orientation toward Interpersonal Goals. The results of the structural models indicated that, in contrast with the hypothesis, Shared Goal Orientation did not augment the relationship between Constitutive Goal Pursuit and EWB. There were no interesting differences between the entire group, and the gender and ethnicity comparisons for Hypothesis 1.

A likely explanation for the lack of relationship between Shared Goal Orientation and EWB in this analysis is that the Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit overshadowed Shared Goal Orientation, which was not included in the Owenz et al. (2010) studies. Indeed, a post hoc analysis confirmed that Shared Goal Orientation is associated with EWB in the absence of the Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit variable.

**Hypothesis 2.** Hypothesis 2 predicted that EWB would not regress on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals, but that EWB would regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals. There was a significant relationship between Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals and EWB for all comparison groups. Contrary to expectation, EWB did not regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals for the full group, or the Latino group. Following the hypothesis, EWB did regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals for the White, non-Latino group.

Research suggests that culturally individualistic people are likely less socialized into familistic cultural values. However, they may be more likely to be report higher
levels of empirically measured Familism (e.g., Comeau, 2012), when it reflects the individual’s personal preferences such as choosing a shared goal (e.g., Cross & Madson, 1997; Phinney, Kim-Jo, Osorio, & Vilhjalms- Dottir, 2005). White, non-Latino populations may find that their EWB was influenced by congruency between Interpersonal Goals and high Shared Goal Orientation because it relates to a personal preference that sets it apart from cultural norms. For Hypothesis 2, the results indicate no significant differences between the entire group and gender comparisons.

**EWB Hypotheses.** In conjunction with the findings from Hypothesis 1, it appears that Shared Goal Orientation generally did not account for additional variance in EWB when the Agentic Modes of Goal Pursuit for Interpersonal Goals were included in the analysis. The findings of Hypotheses 1 and 2 are inconsistent with Aristotle’s conceptualization of the good life (1999), ET (e.g., Fowers & Owenz, 2010), and previous research (e.g., Owenz et al., 2010).

There are a few plausible explanations for the failure of the Shared Goal Orientation hypotheses for EWB for most comparisons. First, maybe the findings disconfirm the theory. This suggests that Communion may not significantly impact EWB as ET suggests. However, it is also possible that the measurement is not robust enough to actually test the theory. Since this is the first test of such a model, future research may focus on identifying and developing a more robust measure of Communion. It is also possible that the relationship between Shared Goal Orientation and EWB was largely overshadowed when included in models with Constitutive or Instrumental Modes of Goal Pursuit. In order to elucidate this possibility, post hoc analyses indicated that Shared Goal Pursuit was correlated with EWB when modeled
independently of Agentic Mode variables. Third, it is possible that the difficulty in identifying this association was due in some way to this sample. One clue to this was that the relationship between Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals and EWB was statistically significant for the White, non-Latino sample. It is therefore possible that this aspect of ET applies only to this population. As this is the first instance of this complex model being examined, it was impossible to come to a clear conclusion.

**Hypothesis 3.** The results of Hypothesis 3 indicated that, as expected, HWB regressed on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals for the entire sample. This association was negative, indicating that the higher one’s Shared Goal Orientation was, the lower one’s HWB would be. This is consistent with the previous studies by Owenz et al. (2010). Contrary to prediction, HWB also regressed on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for the full sample.

There was a significant model fit difference between the Hypothesis 3 Ethnicity comparison model and the full sample model. This finding suggests that ethnicity played an important role in the model paths because the Latino group but not the White, non-Latino group results supported the Shared Goal Orientation hypothesis. The present study is the first to compare ethnic groups within ET models, so these results are a unique and valuable addition to the conceptualization of ET. Consistent with the general model, the results indicated that HWB regressed on Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals for both Latino and White, non-Latino participants.
The Shared Goal Orientation hypothesis results suggest a contrast between the White, non-Latino comparison and both the full sample group and Latino participants. In Hypothesis 3, the full sample and the Latino comparison results indicated that, for Individual Goals, HWB regressed on Shared Goal Orientation. However, results for the White, non-Latino comparison suggested that for Individual Goals, HWB did not relate to Shared Goal Orientation.

As Latino culture often reports higher familism than U.S. White, non-Latino culture (e.g., Sabogal et al., 1987), it may seem counter intuitive for the Latino participants in this study to have a negative relationship between Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals and HWB, whereas White, Non-Latinos do not. Research into Latino cultural practices suggest that familism as a value was promoted through value-congruent behaviors such as living nearby, interacting regularly, and actively taking part in mutual assistance with family members (e.g., Baca Zinn & Wells, 2000; Campos et al., 2014; Sarkisian, Gerena, & Gerstel, 2007). Yet, the negative association in this study may corroborate previous research indicating that implicit motive-incongruent goals are related to greater psychophysiological complaints (Baumann, Kaschel, & Kuhl, 2005) and lower satisfaction with life (Hofer & Chasiotis, 2003). It is possible that these results could relate to Latino individuals in this study experiencing incongruence between their implicit familistic or communal cultural values and the pursuit of Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals, which tends to reduce their HWB. This may be because it takes more effort to overcome cultural norms. The results of the full group may be related to the large proportion of Latino individuals included in the sample and the unknown
impact of the ethnic groups too small to include in the ethnicity comparisons. It is possible that when White, Non-Latino people pursue Individual Goals with low Shared Goal Orientation, congruent with implicit Individualism, their HWB was not affected because it was not something that was effortful or contrary to a cultural script. However, as these cultural values were not directly examined by this study, these are simply possibilities.

Although the model fit statistics suggested that the gender model was a better fit for the data than entire sample model. The men’s data for hypothesis 3 could not be interpreted due to a latent covariate matrix that was non-positive definite. Thus, only the female group could be accounted for by the data. All results found for the female group were consistent with the entire sample.

Results are somewhat inconclusive, but one could speculate that, for women, gender may play a similar role to ethnicity. Research suggests that women across ethnicities (Latinas, East Asians, and Whites), often report greater familism than men, indicative of more social support (Campos, Ullman, Aguilera & Schetter, 2014). Perhaps for that reason, when women held low Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals, it significantly related to higher HWB.

**Hypothesis 4.** The goal hierarchy hypotheses also predicted that in order to experience greater HWB, an individual would need to prioritize Instrumental Goal Pursuit and low Shared Goal Orientation toward Individual Goals. This study was the first to test the relationship between both the Agency Dimension variable of Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit and the Communion Dimension variable of Shared Goal Orientation with HWB for Individual Goals. The results of Hypothesis 4
indicated that HWB regressed positively on Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit and negatively on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals for the entire group. These findings support the goal hierarchy hypothesis for main effects and corroborate the results from Owenz et al. (2010) and Fowers et al. (2010) with respect to HWB. This study also adds the unique differentiation of individual goal type to the relationship between Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit and HWB. Contrary to prediction, Shared Goal Orientation did not augment the relationship between Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit and HWB for Individual Goals. Thus, the model was modified to exclude moderation. These findings indicate that the relationships of HWB with Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit and the Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals are additive but not multiplicative. The goal hierarchy hypotheses were supported for the direct relationships, but not for the expected interactions.

The ethnicity comparison had slightly better model fit statistics than the model with the entire sample. Consistent with the single-group model, HWB regressed onto Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit for Individual Goals for both of the ethnicity comparison groups. In contrast to the full sample model, HWB did not regress on Shared Goal Orientation for Individual Goals in either the Latino or White, non-Latino comparisons. These findings support previous Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit research but complicate the interpretation of the relationship between HWB and Shared Goal Pursuit. The narrow range of ethnic groups compared, may explain the contrasting relationships between HWB and Shared Goal Orientation, for the full sample group and the two ethnic groups. Another possibility is that this relationship
holds for the larger sample, but there is insufficient power to detect it in the smaller ethnicity samples.

The relative fit of the gender comparison model was somewhat worse than the fit of the entire sample model, suggesting that this model specification did not improve model fit. The results suggest that, for Hypothesis 4, gender differentiation did not make a significant impact on the main effects or correlations.

These findings largely support previous ET Agency Dimension research (Fowers et al., 2010), with the addition of Individual Goal type. Hypotheses 3 and 4 results partially corroborate with ET Communion research (Owenz et al., 2010) and theory by reiterating that, for Individual Goals, Shared Goal Orientation is negatively correlated with HWB. These findings lend support to Aristotle’s (1999) conceptualization of the good life, ET (e.g., Fowers & Owenz, 2010), and previous research (e.g., Fowers et al., 2012).

Limitations

This study has several limitations. These limitations were viewed as acceptable in an initial investigation of the augmentation of the relationships between Agentic Modes of Goal Pursuit and Well-Being by Shared Goal Orientation. Instrumental and Constitutive Modes of Goal Pursuit may differ between Interpersonal and Individual Goal models, making their comparison somewhat difficult. Measures of self-report were used and as such, it is possible that response bias could have affected the data. Additionally, measures were only taken at a single time point, so causality cannot be inferred, although causal inference was not among the purposes of this study.
The sample size was acceptable for the retained models (entire sample: $N = 671$, ethnicity comparisons $n = 554$, gender comparisons $n = 667$). Participants in the current study were English-speaking college students from two Southeastern universities, one private and one public, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Perhaps a more diverse sample may have been preferable to test the gender and ethnicity models. The data were collected in 2009, which may impact the generalizability to the present. While all proposed models exhibited a good fit to the data, the fit may be unique to this group and may not be replicable in other samples. The fit of the present models might have benefitted from this particular sample of emerging adults living and studying in a diverse city.

**Conclusions and Future Directions**

This study was the first to explore the Agency Dimension and the Communion Dimension in combination, and the results suggest a fruitful addition to the goals and ET literature. Based on the limitations and implications of this study, the following recommendations for future studies and research direction are made. Given the support for ET generated by this study, future studies distinguishing between EWB and HWB are advised. In addition, the Shared Goal Orientation Scale should be critically examined with an eye toward measuring this concept more robustly, prior to efforts to revamp the theory. More studies using diverse samples and well-validated measures of cultural attitudes and behaviors may expand the current findings and provide a unique cross-cultural perspective on ET. Commonly overlooked by the field of psychology, the present study supports that EWB, Social Goal Pursuit and Constitutive Goal Pursuit provide important information regarding human
flourishing. Further ET studies may add a unique, multi-faceted, interpersonal perspective to understanding human flourishing and goal pursuit. By studying this theory and its constructs, it will be possible to test whether the predominant individualistic, instrumental, and hedonic conceptions of goal pursuit and well-being can be tested. The results of this study suggest that further research in this direction will be quite promising, potentially leading to a richer understanding human flourishing.

Perhaps the most important findings were the support for the importance of relationships between Well-Being and Agency in all four hypotheses. Instrumental and Constitutive Modes of Goal Pursuit were positively related to EWB and HWB for both interpersonal goals and individual goals. This is the first study that differentiated individual and interpersonal goals in the Agency dimension. Future studies should continue to explore the unique variation of individual and interpersonal goals in the analyses of Agency and Well-Being, given the positive findings in this research.

The relationship between goal pursuit and well-being was also supported in most of the Shared Goal Orientation results. The results suggest that HWB regressed onto Shared Goal Orientation for individual goals and interpersonal goals. EWB only regressed on Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals with White, non-Latino individuals when it was paired with the Instrumental Mode of Goal Pursuit. As noted above, cultural incongruence of shared goals and well-being may play a role in the two inconsistent findings found in the ethnicity comparisons. The findings suggest the importance of strengthening the Shared Goal Orientation measure.
One way to improve the measure of Communion for interpersonal goals could involve expanding beyond the self-report of personal goals, by actively collecting data from the other person or people mentioned in their shared goals. The researcher could then query them to gain another perspective on the degree to which the goal was shared.

In order to optimize variance, sample demographics could be expanded. For instance, a valuable extension of the research would be to include a greater number of participants from diverse ethnic, age and gender populations.

It is possible that an older population may express different individual and shared goal content and Shared Goal Orientation. The emerging adults in this sample, identified shared goals, but shared goals are frequently pursued over a long timespan, suggesting that the relationship of Shared Goal Orientation with well-being may be weaker in emerging adults. Aging might increase an individual’s Shared Goal Orientation by providing greater opportunities to participate in and reach life goals such as marriage, children, or long-term occupational teamwork. Maturity may relate to holding a worldview that more prominently considers the needs of others and the pursuit of Shared Goals. Further, EWB models may be different for adults over 25, who generally have lower levels of the EWB indicators of Purpose in Life and Personal Growth (Ryff, 1989, 1991; Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 1998). Future studies should diversify the age range of participants to better understand if age differences exist.

This study was the first to compare ET and ethnicity. The current findings suggest some differences between the whole group model and the two ethnicities large
enough for comparison. Given the ethnic differences found in the results, it is possible that culture plays a role in the relationship between goal pursuit and well-being. In order to elucidate possible relationships between culture and ET, future studies should assess cultural variables in depth. For example, familism (e.g., Comeau, 2012) may be important to flourishing in some ethnic populations. It is also possible that a type 1 error has occurred, and that the two significant ethnicity results may have occurred by chance.

The EWB goal hierarchy was not supported, as the replication of previous results were mixed. EWB only regressed on Constitutive Goal Pursuit and not Shared Goal Orientation for Interpersonal Goals in the complete sample. There are a few potential reasons for this failure. It may be that Shared Goal Orientation simply does not correlate with EWB, when it is included in a model with Constitutive Mode of Goal Pursuit because Shared Goal Pursuit is overshadowed when modeled with Constitutive Goal Pursuit. As this is the first instance of this complex model being examined, it is impossible to come to a confident conclusion. Further, findings may relate to how EWB is measured. Eudaimonia is only possible through action and occurs over time. Future studies should examine the relationships between the Agency Dimension, the Communion Dimension and well-being over time and include goal progress measures. Future studies may also benefit from a daily diary design more aligned with ET. It is also possible that Shared Goal Orientation is not a robust enough measure to actually test the theory. Since this is the first test of such a model, future research may focus on identifying and developing a stronger measure of the Communion Dimension.
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### TABLES

**Table 1**

*Study Construct Definitions for the Good Life and Well-Being*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eudaimonia</strong></td>
<td>“A life comprised of actions that are worthwhile in themselves because they are devoted to characteristically human goods, and pursued with excellence or virtue and within collaborative and meaningful relationships” (Fowers et al., 2010, p. 139).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hedonia</strong></td>
<td>Refers to experiences that are fleeting, affective forms of pleasure, which for some includes experiences such as the excitement, and joy of jumping on a trampoline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Well-being**

| Eudaimonic Well-Being (EWB) | EWB is an imperfect indicator of eudaimonia. It is measured as a latent variable comprised of three subscales of the Psychological Well-Being scale (Ryff, 1989): Purpose in Life, Personal Growth, and Positive Relationships With Others. |
| Hedonic Well-Being (HWB)    | HWB is an imperfect indicator of hedonia. It is measured as a latent variable comprised of three scales: Satisfaction with Life Scale, Affect Balance Scale Positive, and Affect Balance Scale Negative. |
### Table 2

**Study Construct Definitions for the Agency Dimension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Goal Pursuit</strong></td>
<td>Goals that can be pursued with a variety of means to achieve the end goal. Wealth is an example of an instrumental goal because it can be achieved in many ways, such as through hard work, innovation, bank robbery, or inheritance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Goal Orientation</strong></td>
<td>The Instrumental Goal Orientation Scale measures the degree to which an individual views his or her specific goal as a means to an end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constitutive Goal Pursuit</strong></td>
<td>Goals in which the means and ends are inseparable. Aristotle (####) concisely described the constitutive-ends activities as “those, which we seek to derive nothing beyond the actual exercise of the activity” (p. 286).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constitutive Goal Orientation</strong></td>
<td>The Constitutive Goal Orientation Scale measures the degree to which an individual views his or her goal pursuit actions as constituting the goal (i.e., the actions and the goal are inseparable).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3  
*Study Construct Definitions for the Communion Dimension*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Goals</td>
<td>A methodological and theoretical construct used to describe goals that can be pursued, attained, or possessed solely by the individual. Examples of individual goals include achievement, money, status, and pleasure. While other people may be involved with individual goals, other people are not strictly necessary for goal attainment or possession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goals</td>
<td>A theoretical construct that describes goals that can only be pursued and attained through ongoing involvement in communal activities. Shared goals are, by their very nature, collective accomplishments. Common shared goals include peace, teamwork, justice, friendship, and intimacy. Shared goals are among the most meaningful and valued ends people pursue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Goals</td>
<td>A methodological construct used to describe goals, which participants identify as pursued in concert with others. Interpersonal goals contrasts with shared goals, the theoretical construct with which it is similar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>The Shared Goal Orientation Scale measures the degree to which a person believes that his or her “particular goal can only be pursued and accomplished with others and cannot be divided up or competed for such as friendship or teamwork” (Procacci, 2008, p. 105). A high score indicates a shared orientation toward the goal and a low score indicates an individual orientation toward the goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

_Eudaimonic Goal Hierarchy (Fowers & Owenz, 2010, p. 8)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Dimension</th>
<th>Communion Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Goals</td>
<td>Wine connoisseur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Goals</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fame</td>
<td>Team victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate profits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Fit Statistics for Model 1 Comparison with Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Ethnicity (n = 554)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>12,533.203</td>
<td>9,151.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>39.127**</td>
<td>67.911**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AIC, Akaike Information Criterion. CFI, Comparative Fit Index. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.
*p < .05, **p < .001.

Table 6
Standardized Parameter Estimates of Model 1 Comparison with Ethnicity Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Latino (n = 361)</th>
<th>White, non-Latino (n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWB BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>.753**</td>
<td>.766**</td>
<td>.729**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>.795**</td>
<td>.884**</td>
<td>.841**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationships</td>
<td>.738**</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>.689**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>.694**</td>
<td>.653**</td>
<td>.542**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expression</td>
<td>.623**</td>
<td>.679**</td>
<td>.564**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Orientation</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.394**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode WITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td>.583**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .001.
Table 7
Fit Statistics for Model 2 Comparison with Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Gender (n = 667)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>12,533.203</td>
<td>12,299.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^2)</td>
<td>39.127**</td>
<td>68.436**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* AIC, Akaike Information Criterion. CFI, Comparative Fit Index. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.

*\(p < .05\), **\(p < .001\).

Table 8
Parameter Estimates for Model 1 with Gender Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Female (n = 468)</th>
<th>Male (n =199)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWB BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>.753**</td>
<td>.732**</td>
<td>.771**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>.795**</td>
<td>.791**</td>
<td>.832**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationships</td>
<td>.738**</td>
<td>.726**</td>
<td>.764**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>.694**</td>
<td>.715**</td>
<td>.561**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expression</td>
<td>.623**</td>
<td>.509**</td>
<td>.400*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode ON Constitutive Orientation</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode WITH Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.427**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \(p < .05\), **\(p < .001\).
Table 9
Fit Statistics Model 2 with Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Ethnicity (n = 554)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>12,398.646</td>
<td>10,210.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^2)</td>
<td>31.640*</td>
<td>53.186**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. AIC, Akaike Information Criterion. CFI, Comparative Fit Index. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. *\(p < .05\), **\(p < .001\).*

Table 10
Standardized Parameter Estimates of Model 2 with Ethnicity Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Latino (n = 361)</th>
<th>White, non-Latino (n = 193)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWB BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>.731**</td>
<td>.683**</td>
<td>.691**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>.918**</td>
<td>.810**</td>
<td>.820**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationships</td>
<td>.769**</td>
<td>.786**</td>
<td>.796**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.312**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>.926**</td>
<td>.829**</td>
<td>.768**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.435**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.216*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.280**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *\(p < .05\), **\(p < .001\).*
Table 11  
*Model Fit for Model 2 with the Gender Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Gender (n = 667)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>12,398.646</td>
<td>12,329.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>31.640*</td>
<td>39.121**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* AIC, Akaike Information Criterion. CFI, Comparative Fit Index. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.  
*p < .05, **p < .001.

Table 12  
*Parameter Estimates for Model 2 with the Gender Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Female (n = 468)</th>
<th>Male (n = 199)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWB BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>.731**</td>
<td>.712**</td>
<td>.749**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>.918**</td>
<td>.886**</td>
<td>.933**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationships</td>
<td>.769**</td>
<td>.757**</td>
<td>.797**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode</td>
<td>BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.281**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>.926**</td>
<td>.918**</td>
<td>.894**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.240**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode</td>
<td>WITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.731**</td>
<td>.712**</td>
<td>.749**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05, **p < .001.
Table 13  
*Fit Statistics Model 3 with the Ethnicity Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Single Group ((n = 671))</th>
<th>Ethnicity ((n = 554))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>14,104.122</td>
<td>10,953.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^2)</td>
<td>16.715, (p = .0534)</td>
<td>33.837, (p = .0876)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* AIC, Akaike Information Criterion. CFI, Comparative Fit Index. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.  
\(^*p < .05, **p < .001.\)

Table 14  
*Standardized Parameter Estimates of Model 3 with the Ethnicity Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>Single Group ((n = 671))</th>
<th>Latino ((n = 361))</th>
<th>White, non-Latino ((n = )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWB BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.633**</td>
<td>.640**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-.305**</td>
<td>-.373**</td>
<td>-.377**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>.948**</td>
<td>1.006**</td>
<td>.973**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expression</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.416**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWB ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>-.220*</td>
<td>-.183*</td>
<td>-.118,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Orientation</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.422**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \(^*p < .05, **p < .001.\)
Table 15
Model Fit for Model 3 Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Gender (n = 554)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>14,104.122</td>
<td>13,882.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^2)</td>
<td>16.715, (p = .0534)</td>
<td>33.254**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AIC, Akaike Information Criterion. CFI, Comparative Fit Index. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. \(x^2\), Chi-Square.
*p < .05, **p < .001.

Table 16
Parameter Estimates for Model 3 with Gender Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Female (n = 468)</th>
<th>Male (n = 199)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWB BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.733**</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-.305**</td>
<td>-.365**</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>.948**</td>
<td>.894**</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expression</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.373**</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWB ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td>.691**</td>
<td>.587**</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>-.220*</td>
<td>-.177*</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Orientation</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.399**</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITH Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>.229*</td>
<td>Uninterpretable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .001.
Table 17
Fit Statistics Model 4 with Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Ethnicity (n = 554)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>11,176.774</td>
<td>10,751.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2$</td>
<td>16.715**</td>
<td>47.912*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. AIC, Akaike Information Criterion. CFI, Comparative Fit Index. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. $x^2$, Chi-Square.*

* $p < .05, **p < .001.

Table 18
Parameter Estimates of Model 4 with Ethnicity Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Estimates</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Latino (n = 361)</th>
<th>White, non-Latino (n =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWB BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td>.718**</td>
<td>.678**</td>
<td>.807**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.513**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-.400**</td>
<td>-.391**</td>
<td>-.465**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td>.509**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>.658**</td>
<td>.626**</td>
<td>.670**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWB ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.394**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>-.117*</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Orientation</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>.256**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Mode WITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>.143, n.s.</td>
<td>.402**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * $p < .05, **p < .001.
Table 19
Model Fit for Model 4 Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Single Group (n = 671)</th>
<th>Gender (n = 554)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>11,176.774</td>
<td>12,979.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2$</td>
<td>16.715**</td>
<td>60.377**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* AIC, Akaike Information Criterion. CFI, Comparative Fit Index. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. $x^2$, Chi-Square. *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$.  

APPENDIX A

MEASURES

Goals Worksheet

We would like you to list 3 of your most important goals for you as an individual and 3 important goals that involve others. Goals are the outcomes that you are trying to attain over the course of time. Goals are projects or strivings that you think about, plan for, carry out, and sometimes (though not always) complete and succeed at. They can be something that you are trying to do or something that you are trying to avoid.

Some goals are very personal and therefore pursued primarily by yourself. Examples of personal goals include seeking new and exciting experiences, staying healthy, or being less argumentative. Other goals involve both you and another person or you and several others. Examples of these goals include getting married, making good friends, or getting along well with people at work.

Please list 3 of your most important personal goals and 3 of your most important goals that involve others in the spaces provided below.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
Key Actions Worksheet

When you work toward a goal, you often perform specific, concrete actions in order to achieve it. Please type one specific, concrete action that you feel is an important one in helping you pursue your goal.

Goal Examples:

Goal: Take care of my body.
Key Action taken in order to fulfill the goal: I try to eat healthy.

Goal: Earn a lot of money.
Key Action taken in order to fulfill the goal: I work as many hours as I can.

Goal 1:
Key Action 1:

Goal 2:
Key Action 2:

Goal 3:
Key Action 3:

Goal 4:
Key Action 4:

Goal 5:
Key Action 5:

Goal 6:
Key Action 6:
Constitutive Goal Orientation Scale

When you choose the key action needed to reach your goal, you usually have various reasons for choosing that particular key action instead of another. Listed below are reasons why you chose this key action in order to pursue this goal. Please rate to what extent each of the statements listed below was an important reason that you chose this key action to pursue this goal, not reasons why it might in general be a good key action or why someone else might choose it.

For items 1-7, use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all True</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Completely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Because it’s impossible to imagine an alternative to this key action for pursuing this goal.
2. Because doing this key action is the same thing as striving for this goal.
3. Because it is impossible to clearly distinguish between this action and this goal.
4. Because this goal is defined by this key action.
5. Because this key action is at the very heart of this goal.
6. Because doing this key action is without question what it means to pursue this goal.
7. Because doing this key action adds up to striving for this goal.
Instrumental Goal Orientation Scale

Please rate to what extent each of the statements listed below was an important reason that you chose this key action to pursue this goal, not reasons why it might in general be a good key action or why someone else might choose it.

For items 1-7, use
Not at all True 1 2 3 4 5 6 Completely True

1. Because this key action is the most convenient way to reach this goal.
2. Because this key action is the least risky way to achieve this goal.
3. Because doing this key action is the easiest way to achieve this goal.
4. Because this key action is the least painful way to reach this goal.
5. Because this key action is the most efficient way to reach this goal.
6. Because this key action most reduces the effort required to achieve this goal.
7. Because this key action is the most cost-effective way to reach this goal.
Shared Goal Orientation Scale

For items 1-10, use

| Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very much so |

1. To what extent would success with this goal belong as much to someone else as it does to you?
2. To what extent is success in a close relationship linked to success with this goal?
3. To what extent is success in this goal primarily dependent on someone else changing?
4. To what extent do you consider your goal a partnership with someone else?
5. To what extent is collaboration with others unavoidable in pursuing this goal?
6. To what extent are you pursuing this goal because you share a desire it with at least one another person?
7. To what extent would failure in this goal damage an important relationship or prevent an important relationship from forming?
Personal Projects Rating Matrix

Please rate your goal on each item using this 1-10 scale with 1 being “not at all” and 10 being “extremely.”

“not at all”  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 “extremely”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this goal challenging for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How committed are you to the completion of this goal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you feel you are in control of this goal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How difficult do you find it to carry out this goal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you enjoy working on this goal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some goals are intrinsically fun, whimsical or delightful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much fun is this goal for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is this goal to you at the present time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How successful do you think you will be at this goal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this goal pleasurable, that is, comfortable,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxing, self-indulgent, or hedonistic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of us have some goals that are “really us” and some others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that we don’t really feel ourselves when doing. To</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what extent does this goal feel distinctly “you”-like a personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trademark-as opposed to being quite alien to you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How stressful is it for you to carry out this goal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you feel that the amount of time available for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working on this goal is adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this goal consistent with the values that guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your life?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Expressive Activities Questionnaire

We would like to know how you see the actions you have named as important for reaching your goals. For each of the following questions, please choose the number on the answer sheet that best represents your feelings about the actions that help you to reach your goal.

For item 1, please use the following scale:

Dislike to Do Very Much   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Like to Do Very Much

___ 1. This activity gives me my greatest feeling of really being alive.

For item 2, please use the following scale:

Not at All Important   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Extremely Important

___ 2. When I engage in this activity I feel more satisfied than I do when engaged in most other activities.

For items 3-6, please use the following scale:

Strongly Disagree   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Strongly Agree

___ 3. This activity gives me my strongest feeling that this is who I really am.

___ 4. When I engage in this activity I feel that this is what I was meant to do.

___ 5. I feel more complete or fulfilled when engaging in this activity than I do when engaged in most other activities.

___ 6. I feel a special fit or meshing when engaging in this activity.
Affect Balance Scale

Please answer each question using this rating scale: 1=yes and 0=no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you feel particularly excited or interested in something?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did you feel proud because someone complimented you on something you had done?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did you feel pleased about having accomplished something?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did you feel on top of the world?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did you feel that things were going your way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did you feel so restless that you couldn't sit long in a chair?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did you feel very lonely or remote from other people?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did you feel bored?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did you feel depressed or very unhappy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Did you feel upset because someone criticized you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Psychological Well-Being Scale

The following set of questions deals with how you feel about yourself and your life. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Rate each question using the following scale:

1  2  3  4  5  6
Strongly disagree  Agree

1. Most people see me as loving and affectionate.
2. I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons.
3. I feel good when I think of what I’ve done in the past and what I hope to do in the future.
4. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.
5. In general, I feel that I continue to learn more about myself as time goes by.
6. I live life one day at a time and don’t really think about the future.
7. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns.
8. I am the kind of person who likes to give new things a try.
9. I tend to focus on the present, because the future nearly always brings me problems.
10. I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.
11. I don’t want to try new ways of doing things – my life is fine the way it is.
12. I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.
13. It is important to me to be a good listener when close friends talk to me about their problems.
14. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.
15. My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me.
16. I don’t have many people who want to listen when I need to talk.
17. When I think about it, I haven’t really improved much as a person over the years.
18. I don’t have a good sense of what it is I’m trying to accomplish in life.
19. I feel like I get a lot out of my friendships.
20. In my view, people of every age are able to continue growing and developing.
21. I used to set goals for myself, but that now seems like a waste of time.
22. It seems to me that most other people have more friends than I do.
23. With time, I have gained a lot of insight about life that has made me a stronger, more capable person.
24. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.
25. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.
26. I have a sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.
27. I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself.
28. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.
29. I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things.
30. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.
31. I often feel as if I’m on the outside looking in when it comes to friendships.
32. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
33. I sometimes feel as I’ve done all there is to do in life.
34. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.
35. I enjoy seeing how my views have changed and matured over the years.
36. My aims in life have been more a source of satisfaction than frustration to me.
37. I find it difficult to really open up when I talk with others.
38. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.
39. I find it satisfying to think about what I have accomplished in life.
40. My friends and I sympathize with each other’s problems.
41. There is truth in the saying that you can’t teach an old dog new tricks.
42. In the final analysis, I’m not so sure that my life adds up to much.
Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. For each item, use

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

to indicate your agreement with each item by selecting the appropriate number on the line following that item.

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.